OCT 11 1957

OLD FAITH AND NEW KNOWLEDGE

No longer property of the
Dayton & Montgomery Co. Public Library

BOOKS BY

JAMES H. SNOWDEN.

SCENES AND SAYINGS IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

A SUMMER ACROSS THE SEA.

THE WORLD A SPIRITUAL SYSTEM.

THE BASAL BELIEFS OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE COMING OF THE LORD.

IS THE WORLD GROWING BETTER?

CAN WE BELIEVE IN IMMORTALITY?

A WONDERFUL NIGHT.

A WONDERFUL MORNING.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD.

THE CITY OF TWELVE GATES.

THE MEANING OF EDUCATION.

THE ATTRACTIONS OF THE MINISTRY.

THE TRUTH ABOUT CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MORMONISM.

JESUS AS JUDGED BY HIS ENEMIES.

THE MAKING AND MEANING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IMMORTALITY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN THOUGHT.

SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS, SEVEN ANNUAL VOLS.

OLD FAITH
AND
NEW KNOWLEDGE

BY

JAMES H. SNOWDEN

1852-

United
BL
240
.S67
1968
40,978

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
1928

OLD FAITH AND NEW KNOWLEDGE
COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY HARPER & BROTHERS
PRINTED IN THE U. S. A. FIRST EDITION

D-C

6

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.—PAUL.

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—ERASMUS.

Christianity is now for the first time in its history confronted with a scientific-minded world. It must adjust itself to the new world-view or it will wither.—MATTHEW SPINKA.

We believe that the Holy Spirit in leading the Church into all truth, may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these Creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems from time to time may demand.—Lausanne World Conference on Faith and Order, August 1927.

The old order changeth, yielding to the new,
And God fulfills himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
—TENNYSON.

New occasions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward, still, and onward,
Who would keep abreast of Truth.
—LOWELL.

Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea!
—HOLMES.

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.—JESUS.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY DAYTON
Mac Ba
240345
Pettibone-McLean JUL 6 '29
OCT 11 1957

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/oldfaithnewknowl0000jame_g2o5

PREFACE

This book may contain little that has not been said before, but the same things must be constantly restated as the trees bring forth the same leaves and fruit year after year. In the restatement there may be something new, old truth may be brought up to date with new lines of approach and angles of vision, new knowledge and illustrations and adaptations. Readers will read one book who may not see another in which virtually the same things are said, and this is a further reason for new books that may go over old ground.

There are different classes of readers and some things intended for one kind are not intended for another. There are things in this book that some readers will not need but others may, and this is justification for their presence in these pages. In the effort to make the treatment of the subject somewhat comprehensive passages and chapters have been inserted that might have been omitted had the purpose of the author been different. For example, there are elementary chapters on the nature of religion and of science that might have been abridged or compressed into paragraphs, but it was felt that foundational knowledge of these subjects is essential to any full-orbed treatment of the general theme. Other readers may object that such a brief summary as is given of the evidences for evolution is unnecessary if not out of place in such a book, for it is so elementary as to be without value to those who have some general knowledge of the subject and too slight to give untrained readers any adequate conception of the matter. But again such a treatment of the subject is not intended for all readers, but for those that may have little knowledge of the technical books on the subject and would in some measure be helped by such an outline however brief.

The purpose of the book is to take a general view of the relations of faith and knowledge or of religion and science and especially to trace the process of their adjustment through the Bible

itself. It is not written to stir up controversy—though of course it will have this effect with some readers—but to throw such light on the general course and present relations of these fields as will help readers, even those who may differ widely from the author, to see the subject in a somewhat broader way and reach conclusions more in accordance with the general and inevitable outcome of the relations of old faith and new knowledge. The author has not consciously written a line in it to irritate or do injustice of any kind to any one, but has deleted from the manuscript many which he feared might have such effect. Even where differences with others are stated sharply and criticisms may seem severe or unfounded, yet is he trying to speak the truth in love. Anyway, we must all admit that in the long run the truth will prevail and is always the best. To bring out this fact and illustrate it in relation to the vital subject of our faith in its contact with our growing knowledge is the sincere object of this book. The author is ever fully aware that other men have as much right and room to hold their differing views as he has to maintain his, and he delights to remember Goethe's repeated refrain in "Wilhelm Meister":

> To give room for wandering is it
> That the world is made so wide.

CONTENTS

PREFACE. vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.

1. The General Problem Stated. 2
2. Change and Controversy in the Field of Truth. 3
3. The Nature and Obligation of Truth. 5
   (1.) The Nature of Truth. 5
   (2.) The Infinitude of Truth. 9
   (3.) The Obligation of Truth. 11
4. Concerning the Use and Abuse of Names. 14
5. Fundamentalism and Modernism. 17
   (1.) What Is Fundamentalism? 18
   (2.) What Is Modernism? 18
   (3.) Fundamentalism and Modernism Compared. 23

II. RELIGION.

1. Faith and Religion Defined. 28
   (1.) Faith. 28
   (2.) Religion. 32
2. The Roots of Religion. 34
   (1.) Historical Roots of Religion. 34
   (2.) Our Constitutional Intuitions. 35
   (3.) In the Feelings. 35
   (4.) In the Intellect. 37
   (5.) In the Will. 38
3. Authority in Religion. 39
   (1.) The Primary Authority of Truth and Right. 39
   (2.) The Place of Reason in Authority. 40
   (3.) The Place of Feeling in Authority. 42
   (4.) The Place of Will in Authority. 43
   (5.) Value Judgments. 44
   (6.) The Christian Consciousness. 46

4. Theology a Progressive Science. 51
(1.) All Science Is Progressive. 51
(2.) Theology Shares in This Progress. 51
(3.) The Old and the New in Theology. 53

III. Science.
1. Definition and Method of Science. 55
2. Kinds and Relations Among the Sciences. 59
(1.) Kinds of Science. 59
(2.) Relations Among the Sciences. 59
(3.) Authority Among the Sciences. 60
3. The Scientific Spirit. 60
(1.) Love of Truth. 60
(2.) Affinity and Sympathy. 61
(3.) Humility. 63
4. Development of the Scientific Spirit. 63

IV. General Relations of Religion and Science.
1. Inadequate Solutions. 68
2. The Unity of the World. 71
3. Religion Needs Science. 75
(1.) To Be Imbued with the Scientific Spirit. 75
(2.) For Constructive Material in Theology. 76
(3.) For Practical Help in Its Work. 77
4. Science Needs Religion. 78
(1.) Reverence for Spiritual Realities. 78
(2.) Deeper Insight into the World. 80
(3.) To Give Human World Essential Worth. 80
5. Ways of Knowing the World. 82

V. Modern Views of the Bible.
1. The Processes of Modern Criticism. 90
2. The Old Testament. 91
3. The New Testament. 93
(1.) Order of Production of the Books. 93
(2.) Dates of the Four Gospels. 93
(3.) Features of the Gospel Narratives. 96
(4.) Authors of the Bible Competent and Honest. 97

4. Some General Aspects of the Bible. 97
(1.) Development in the Bible. 97
(2.) Inspiration and Inerrancy. 99
(3.) The Principle of Modernism in the Bible. 107

VI. The Principle of Modernism in the Old Testament.
1. The Story of Creation. 109
2. The Story of the Flood. 114
3. Abraham the Pioneer of New Faith. 116
4. Moses the Modernist. 119
(1.) The Decalogue. 119
(2.) Mosaic Legislation. 122
5. The Progressive Hebrew Conception of God. 123
(1.) The Sovereignty of God. 124
(2.) The Character of God. 125
6. A Progressive Scale of Moral and Spiritual Values. 126
7. The Vision of the Prophets. 128

VII. The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament: I. In the Teaching of Jesus.
1. Relation of the New Testament to the Old. 132
2. The Principle of Modernism in the Teaching of Jesus. 134
(1.) The Attitude of Jesus Towards the Old Testament. 134
(2.) The Conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees. 135
(3.) The Teachings of Jesus. 137

VIII. The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament: II. In the Apostolic Church.
1. The Conflict of the Old Faith with the New. 146
2. Stephen the First Martyr for Modernism. 147
3. Peter the Progressive. 150
4. The First Council at Jerusalem: Modernism the Issue. 151
5. Broadening Liberalism at Antioch. 154
6. Paul the Master Modernist. 156
7. The Second Council at Jerusalem: Modernism Again the Issue. 159
8. Modernistic Writings in the New Testament. 162

(1.) The Gospel According to Matthew. 162
(2.) The Epistle to the Hebrews. 163
(3.) Paul's Letter to the Galatians. 164
9. General Modernistic Elements in the New Testament. 165

IX. The Principle of Modernism in the History of the Christian Church.
1. Gnosticism. 172
2. The Church Fathers. 176
3. The Ancient Councils and Creeds. 179
4. Scholasticism. 182
5. The Renaissance. 186
6. The Reformation. 189
7. The Modern Churches. 193
8. Modern Councils and Creeds. 196

X. Historic Conflicts Between Theology and Science.
1. Some Historic Points of the Conflict. 200
(1.) The Flat Earth. 200
(2.) The Moving Sun. 202
(3.) The Six Days of Creation. 206
(4.) Evolution. 207
2. The Conflict Reviewed. 220
(1.) The Conflict Not Peculiar to Science and Religion. 220
(2.) Never a Sharp Division Between Scientists and Theologians. 220
(3.) The Faults Have Not All Been on One Side. 221
(4.) These Conflicts Have Been Adjusted into Wider Harmony. 221

XI. Modernism To-day.
1. In the Field of Science. 223
(1.) The Vastness of the Universe. 223
(2.) The Universality of Law. 228
(3.) Scientific Materialism. 230
2. In the Field of Philosophy. 235
(1.) Agnosticism. 235

(2.) Pantheism. 238
(3.) Personalism. 239
3. In the Field of Religion. 242
(1.) General Effects. 242
(2.) Special Effects. 245
(a.) Biblical Criticism. 246
(b.) Inspiration and Authority of Scripture. 247
(c.) Systematic Theology. 248
(d.) Credal Revision. 250
(e.) The Social Gospel. 252
(f.) The Kingdom of God. 253
(g.) Practical Results. 254
(3.) When Shall We Teach Modernism? 257

XII. Summary and Conclusion.
1. Summary. 261
(1.) Introduction. 261
(2.) Religion. 261
(3.) Science. 261
(4.) General Relations of Religion and Science. 262
(5.) Modern Views of the Bible. 263
(6.) The Principle of Modernism in the Old Testament. 263
(7.) The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament: I. In the Teaching of Jesus. 263
(8.) The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament: II. In the Apostolic Church. 264
(9.) Modernism in the History of the Christian Church. 264
(10.) Historic Conflicts Between Theology and Science. 265
(11.) Modernism To-day. 266
(12.) Summary. 266
2. Conclusion. 266
Index. 275

OLD FAITH AND NEW KNOWLEDGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Landmarks have always been fruitful sources of litigation. They disturb the peace of neighbors and neighborhoods and breed innumerable lawsuits. Most of the wars of history have clashed across these divisive lines. Nations frown at each other along their frontiers, bristling with guns, and many a blue boundary on the map has turned red with human blood.

The planet has also been plotted and partitioned into other divisions. Variously colored maps chart its zones and latitudes and longitudes, its winds and weather, its mineral and agricultural resources, its lines of trade and travel, its regional diseases and races and religions. But under all and common to all these various aspects is the planet itself which embraces and unifies them all.

The same figure may be carried further. The physical planet is a mere atom in the infinitely vaster world of reality or truth, which also has its partitions and delimitations. This world is also mapped into regions with their boundary lines. Every science has its special claim staked off in the field of truth. Astronomy has its vast province in the heavens, geology has its domain on the earth, and physics, chemistry, psychology and others each has its own. So also ethics and philosophy and religion claim their respective territories. Each of these sciences has a certain degree of dominance and authority within its own field. But these fields have their frontiers which impinge on one another and are often attended with overlapping claims and discordant interpretations and mutual conflicts. Yet underneath them lies the great world of reality which embraces and must unify them all. These unsettled and clashing frontiers are due to our partial knowledge and imperfect interpretations and are not inherent in the underlying world of truth itself. Larger knowledge and better understanding will harmonize and unify them.

Two of the largest and most fundamental of these fields are old faith and new knowledge, or religion and science in their mutual relations. The boundaries and connections between these two have, more than any other frontiers in the fields of human thought, been attended with misunderstanding and friction, unfriendliness and hostility.

The aim of this book is to consider once more these competing and at times antagonistic fields of truth and endeavor to find their deeper unity and harmonious coherence in a more comprehensive system of truth. The problem is as old as human thought itself, but it must be repeatedly worked over again. It is one of those adjustments in our ever-changing and complex human world that must be continually readjusted and brought up to date.

1. The General Problem Stated

We may divide our total knowledge for our present purpose into two general kinds, religious and scientific. The one relates to our life of faith in the things of the spirit and of fellowship with God, and the other relates to our apprehension of the facts and laws of the natural world; the one moves predominantly in the region of the spiritual and the other in the region of the material, though at many points they overlap and may coincide or collide.

These two kinds of knowledge have always been in the world and are experienced in some degree by all men from the lowest savages up to the highest civilized races. But there has always been special difficulty in adjusting these two spheres of truth and experience into coherence and harmony. Yet both of these kinds of knowledge are grounded in reality and are necessary, and neither ought to or can suppress the other. They both have their rights and must live together. These age-long differences have been the source of much trouble and doubt and distress, dividing men into warring groups and even resulting in persecution and bloodshed staining some of the darkest pages of history. The mutual respect and coöperation of religion and science, the cause of truth, the peace of the church, the moral and social welfare of society and general good-will among men call for such

adjustment of the respective spheres and relations of our faith and knowledge as will conserve the truth and right of both of these fundamental fields. This is especially the need of the present day when these relations have become unusually sensitive and inflamed.

2. Change and Controversy in the Field of Truth

We may wonder why the fields of truth and life are so swept with constant waves of change and why so little agreement has been reached and controversy still rages on points that we regard as so important to our human welfare. Many of these matters, as Voltaire said, have been "discussed for four thousand years in four thousand ways," and little has yet been settled. Must our human world ever remain "a dust of systems and of creeds"?

Let us not be surprised at constant change and controversy, for these are inherent in our developing world and in the partial and progressive understanding of our finite human minds. It is by these processes that the world gets forward and rolls through the shadow of the globe into the younger day. And they are by no means peculiar to the field of religion, for they rage as incessantly in the fields of science, politics, literature, art, and all other fields of human interest.

Let us not think of change as only danger and evil: it is also opportunity and hope. Change is another name for evolution which is another name for divine providence. Change is God's instrument of progress. Change cooled the molten planet into rock and carved it into continents and embowered it in beauty and pushed it up the slope of life to the highest point of human achievement. Change speeds the process of the suns and spins the thread of one increasing purpose that runs through the ages. It would be terrible if things did not change. A static world would be a stagnant and dead world. Only a changing world can live and move forward and mount upward.

Change is the opportunity and hope of our human world. Were we bound in a world of fixity and finality, all the vision and victory, adventure and daring and audacity, surprise and romance, ambition and aspiration would be eliminated from our life and it

would be reduced to a dead level and eternal monotony. No new morning would ever dawn upon us, no wider horizon and loftier sky would ever open before us, never would we have the joy of exclaiming,

> We are the first that ever burst
> Into this silent sea.

Never for us would

> experience be an arch wherethro'
> Gleams that untravell'd world, whose margin fades
> For ever and for ever when we move.

And never could

> our purpose hold
> To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
> Of all the western stars, until we die.

Especially is change the law of life from the amœba up to man. Even the crystal changes and the human brain must constantly sprout or atrophy. All the fields of thought are ceaselessly changing and springing up in new harvests. New science and new theology are equally inevitable. To stand where our fathers stood is nothing to our credit. Oaks and oysters may do that, but not men. And anyway the thing cannot be done, for humanity is ever on the march and at least is dragging us along with its rear stragglers. If we have beliefs that never change, they are probably withered husks and are dead at the root.

Even change that comes through controversy is not necessarily evil, but may be good. Controversy is the collision of vital convictions forging and fusing their differences into broader harmony and higher unity. Controversy is the Hegelian dialectic of developing being, struggling through thesis and antithesis into higher synthesis. Controversy is the weapon by which truth has won its victories in every field of knowledge and faith. Controversy is education. Controversy is courage. Controversy is conscience. Controversy is the martyr's blood that has sown the seed of richer harvests. The Bible is a book of controversy and rings with the sound of battle from the beginning to the end. Jehovah held a controversy with the Jews, and Jesus with the Pharisees. Controversy has been the travail and birth of all the great religious and scientific ideas that have been born into the

world. It is not necessarily a bad sign when the church is swept with controversy. Such difference and debate, especially when kept free from bitterness and conducted in a truth-seeking and chivalrous spirit, is infinitely better than religious indifference and spiritual stagnation and death, and out of it will come wider truth and better faith and more fruitful life. It is a storm, but a storm cleanses the sky and washes it blue and refreshes the grass into a more vivid green and leaves the atmosphere pure and sweet.

May author and reader be able to go through and come out of the controversies involved in our subject with our minds unclouded by partisanship and passion, our spirits unruffled and serene and our brotherly good-will and fellowship undisturbed.

3. The Nature and Obligation of Truth

The foundation of all knowledge and the search of all science and of all religion is truth, and therefore it is of fundamental importance that we have a right conception of what truth is and then be loyal to it.

(1) *The nature of truth* is not so simple a matter as it may at first seem and the question, What is truth? is one of the deepest problems of philosophy. In a general way we may say that truth is a state of mind in which our ideas correspond with their objects, our thoughts with things. Truth is right relations with reality. Truth is concord with the universe. Truth is harmony with God.

These statements, however, call for further examination and closer analysis and understanding. When we say that truth is the correspondence of our ideas with their objects, or of our perceptions with things, we are not to suppose that there is anything like a literal copy or image of the object in our mind. We may see what appears to be an oblong red disk, but clearly there is nothing oblong in shape and red in color in our consciousness. On looking again we may see that the object is not oblong but round and not red but green. We are now seeing it from a different point of view and in a different light. Even when we first see it the object is a state of our mind or experience: we have constructed and interpreted it; we have formed a judgment of what it is, and

every piece of knowledge is an act of judgment. On further examination we are forced to reconstruct and reinterpret the object so as to bring it into harmony with our larger experience; and so we may keep on remodeling and reinterpreting it until we get an idea of it that will fit in with all our experience and work under all circumstances. We now see that truth is such a construction and interpretation of our experience of an object as holds good under all our growing light and life. This view replaces ideas as literal copies of objects with a deeper view.

The psychologists work this view out for us. Many unreflecting minds still hold the "copy" idea of truth. "They fancy," says Professor Münsterberg, "that truth is only a kind of photographic copy of outer reality. They are not aware that every so-called truth is a remodeling of life-impressions, a reconstruction of experience, a free creation of the intellect, which can never be severed from the purposes of the creating mind." There is thus a large subjective element in the construction of truth, and we see things not only as they are but also as we are. We shape and color our perceptions and interpretation of reality with the contents and moods of our own minds. There is no escaping this subjective process, but we need to watch and guide and guard it so that it does not misrepresent and distort the objective reality.

Our ideals of reality are thus our interpretations of it and they are true in proportion to the degree in which they work and enable us to use it. When they will not fit into our experience and will not work we say they are not true; and we say they are true when they do fit and work. If we interpret a white powder as being common salt it will work one way with us, and if we interpret it as being arsenic it will work another way, and on a correct interpretation of it may depend life or death. This view of truth as subjective interpretation does not in the least deny the existence of the objective reality and does not release us from honestly endeavoring to perceive and construct and interpret it according to its real nature, but it does give us a closer view of truth as such a subjective construction and interpretation of reality as will enable us to use it under all conditions.

This view of truth enables us to see the relation of theory to fact. A theory is a tentative explanation or interpretation of a

fact and therefore enters into the very nature and constitution of the fact itself. It is sometimes said that we may hold to a fact as a fact and that our theory of it is relatively independent of it and therefore unimportant. The fact of the atonement, for example, is said to be the vital thing, and our theory of it makes little or no difference. But a theory is a part of the fact and may easily be the most important aspect of it.[1] "Fancy with fact," as Browning expresses it, "is just one fact the more." In theory sight passes into insight. Our theory as to whether the death of a man is due to disease, or accident, or suicide, or murder, makes all the difference in the world as to the nature of the fact. Our theory about the Great War determines the very root and cause of it as we see it. Theory and fact cannot be separated but are constitutional elements of the reality in question. The bare fact of a printed sentence is simply a series of curiously-shaped black marks on a white page; but the meaning of these marks is immensely the most important part of the fact and is its very soul. Fact and theory, outer form and inner meaning, must go together, and both form and meaning in their union constitute the entire fact. In any given case of fact there may be a bony skeleton or hard core of reality that does not change, but remains fixed through all theories about it, and on this ultimate deposit of reality all theorists may agree. In the case of the dead man the fact that he is dead stands the same whether his death was caused by disease, or accident, or suicide, or murder. All readers of a sentence may agree as to the form of the words, but disagree widely as to their meaning; that is, they differ about what the real fact is. Though we may isolate the skeleton of a fact, yet the fact in all its relations cannot be isolated; it shoots out roots and branches and filaments, causes and consequences, that impinge upon the frontiers of the universe and wrap themselves around the center and core of ultimate reality. One truth thus involves all truth, and we are beginning to catch glimpses of the complexity and infinitude of truth

[1] "There is no such thing as a fact without a meaning. The meaning of a fact is not added from outside as if the fact would be complete without it. It is constitutive of the fact itself." W. G. de Burgh, *The Legacy of the Ancient World*, p. 432.

and to see how in its shoreless maze and mystery and unplumbed depths each one can take in only one little angle or segment of it and others may see other aspects of it. The little circle of the individual eye cannot embrace and comprehend the great circle of the universe and of God. This is the truth poetically expressed in Tennyson's "Flower in the crannied wall"—if we could "understand root and all and all in all" we "should know what God and man is."

We also now see that truth is a subjective state of mind in which one part of our experience of reality is brought into working relations with other parts of our experience, and in general truth is harmonized experience. Truth, then, is a unified state of consciousness in relation to our own mental contents and to our environment, running out to the outmost bound of our universe, and its logical limit and full and final perfection is harmony with ourselves and our world and with God.

We also see at this point the relation of truth and experience. These two are sometimes put in opposition to each other and it is said that we may have knowledge of subject without experience of it, as we may have knowledge of a foreign country without experience of it through personal visitation. Such a distinction may be loosely held for practical purposes, but it does not strictly hold. Our knowledge of a subject is itself experience of that subject as far as it goes. The truth in the distinction is that we may hold a truth only as an intellectual experience without carrying it into fuller experience by practicing it. Experience is philosophically defined by Webster as "The sum total of the conscious events which compose an individual life," and Webster quotes James Ward as saying, "All that we know and feel and do, all our facts and theories, all our emotions and ideals and ends, may be included in this one term—experience." Any knowledge of a fact or faith in a creed is so much experience, but it may need to be deepened and enriched by the further experience of practice.

Truth as interpretation is a process of gradual and repeated reconstruction of our experience by the method of trial and error. Each new view works until it falls out of relation to wider experience and then it is reconstructed into closer harmony with other truth. The Copernican theory of astronomy illustrates this on a

grand scale, and the theory of evolution is even yet passing through these stages of successive reconstruction. Such interpretation is also a social process in which many minds must engage and cooperate and often through long periods of time. It took a hundred years to settle the heliocentric theory of the solar system on a solid basis, and it has been said by a high authority that it will take two hundred years to work the Einstein theory of relativity out into its ultimate form and general agreement. No one thinker can settle a great truth, but many other thinkers must work it through and confirm it. A great truth, like a great cathedral, may be the work of generations in rising from its foundation to its finished tower. Truth is a social process and product.

This view also enables us to see why men so generally and widely differ in their beliefs of what is true, for they differ endlessly in the width and depth and richness of their total experience and this enters into and in a degree determines their views of truth and turns the world of truth into "a dust of systems and of creeds." This necessary diversity should also lead us to try to see truth from other men's points of view and to exercise great patience and sympathy and charity towards those who differ from us. They also probably have seen and seized some threads in the complex web of reality that we have missed and we should try to see and incorporate them in our view. It is because truth lies at the very foundation of our discussion that we have engaged in this psychological analysis of its nature and processes.

(2) *The Infinitude of Truth.* It is important to keep in mind throughout our discussion that truth is manifold and infinite. Any single truth has roots and relations running out into and interlacing with the whole organism of the universe. The kingdom of truth has at least as many gates as the city which John saw coming down from heaven to earth: four sides, three gates on each side, twelve gates open day and night. God himself dwells in this city of truth and therefore it is infinitely wide and complex and profound. It fills the horizon, encircles the earth and leaps beyond the stars. It embraces the physical universe which may be only a tiny island in the infinite spiritual world and then loses itself in the all-encompassing splendor of the divine omniscience.

Different kinds or means of truth find each its own gate. Sense

perception enters through the gates of the senses and pours into our minds streams of perceptual experience. Through the eye gate enter light and shade, color and beauty and all the splendors and majesties of sky and landscape, sun and stars; through hearing, the meaning and the music of human speech and all the concord of sweet sounds; through touch and taste and odor, other contacts with the world, each bringing in its special reports. Science gives us a more exact and systematized account of the world, and philosophy a still deeper view. Reason is another avenue through which truth enters our minds, the mystic intuitions and yearnings of the heart open another gate; imagination is a Gate Beautiful, literature and art are ivory gates, and revelation and religion are golden gates opening towards God and heaven. All these many gates let truth come converging and crowding in upon us, and all these views and visions combine into the vast system of truth that is our universe as we experience it.

We cannot hope, then, to house all truth in the little hut of any one brain, or crowd it into one creed, or ever exhaust it or even approach its frontiers; much less can we ever reach that ultimate reality in which God hides the secret of His being and the mysteries of His ways. The Scriptures are full of this Christian agnosticism in which we are warned that we cannot by searching find Him out and even the most majestic heavens are but gleams of His glory. "Lo, these are but the outskirts of His ways, and how small a whisper do we hear of Him!" It is not surprising, therefore, that we do not all agree in our views of truth, or that the world is a dust of systems and of creeds. Any one mind, however wide its outlook and far its horizon, can compass only one tiny angle, can catch only one aspect of total reality; the greatest philosopher has only picked up a few pebbles on the boundless shore of truth, and all human knowledge heaped together is only an infinitesimal portion of the infinite whole. It is this infinitude of truth, as we have seen, that makes our search for it an endless task in both time and eternity, and it is this also that constitutes the surprise and wonder, adventure and romance, the daring and audacity of our quest for it.

Because of this infinite complexity and ever-growing width and wealth of truth we are constantly falling into error and inconsistency in our own views. Ruskin understood this fact when he

said that truth is always polygonal and that he never considered that he had expressed his mind fully on any subject until he had contradicted himself at least three times. This should keep us from ever thinking that we have exhausted any subject in our apprehension of it, and we should leave wide room in our views for variant aspects of it in other views. There is always some measure of truth in any doctrine that gains acceptance, however great or total seems its error; and it is this element of truth in it that gives it currency, for a pure error could not go on or even get started at all. No doctrine can be wholly wrong. No lie can be absolutely false. Truth and error hardly ever fall sharply apart on opposite sides of a dividing line, but they are more or less intermingled. We should therefore be slow to deny any doctrine totally, but should endeavor to see and seize the truth in it and incorporate it in our own view.

Though many are the paths that lead into the city of truth, some people are surprised and disquieted, if not alarmed, when they see other people finding their ways into the kingdom of religious truth through other gates than their own. They become excited and think that something ought to be done about it; they may even resort to ecclesiastical discipline or civil law to stop it. As well might they try, by such means, to stop the action of gravity or slow down the unreasonable velocity of light. Pitifully narrow, bigoted and blind is the mind that thinks its forms of belief are the only and final expression of truth and that does not leave many gates open through which other souls can find their way into this infinitely wide and rich domain.

All this should put us on our guard, in the beginning of our study, against wholesale and dogmatic condemnation of doctrines that seem to us erroneous and should beget in us a spirit of patience and tolerance and sympathy towards them. In the infinite realm of truth there is plenty of room for many men of many minds. It will help us in finding truth to remember that other men looking through other eyes are also finding it and that all our views and visions are but broken lights of God.

(3) *The obligation of truth* springs from its nature. Being right relations to reality, truth is the necessary condition and means of life and of using the world and turning all its facts and forces

into our servants. It is the solid ground on which we must walk, the safe path we must follow, the light that must guide us, and the atmosphere we must breathe. Truth is the bond and vital breath of all social life. Error is a wrong concept of and working relation with the world and thus throws us out of gear with it. It is a broken rail in our track that will plunge us into the ditch. Error puts out the light of the mind and sends us groping and stumbling around in the dark. Falsity undermines the foundations of character, unlooses all the bonds of the soul, destroys trustworthiness and dissolves society.

It is therefore a primary duty of the mind to seek truth and avoid error. The love of truth is the supreme loyalty of the soul because it is the ground and means of all other loyalties. The love of truth is the premier virtue and finest bloom of the human spirit. There is something profoundly solemn and sacred about truth. A lie is an essential sin. A lie is so much lost soul. It is never right. Falsity is a pervasive poison that infects and destroys all worths and relations. To lie is the only thing that God cannot do. A lie issuing from His lips would blight the universe and crack and shatter His great white throne. Truth is the eternal nature of God, His supreme attribute and glory. Truth is the Law that has its home in the bosom of God and the moral gravitation of the universe by which the everlasting heavens are kept fresh and strong.

Scientific men generally have in a special degree a sense of the solemn nature and obligation of truth. Mendeléeff, the great Russian chemist, in the Preface to his work on *Solutions,* writes of his mother as follows: "When dying she said, 'Refrain from illusions and insist on work and not on words. Patiently search divine and scientific truth.' She understood how often dialectical methods deceive, how much there is still to be learned, and how, with the aid of science, without violence, with love but firmness, all superstition, untruth and error are removed, bringing in their stead the safety of undiscovered truth, freedom for further development, general welfare, and inward happiness. Dmitri Mendeléeff regards as sacred a mother's dying words." [2]

---

[2] Quoted in Harrow's *The Romance of the Atom,* p. 34.

The obligation of truth wins the consent and confirmation of the universal conscience of the world. It is embedded in proverbs, the crystallized diamonds of human wisdom, and in the sayings of philosophers, poets and priests of the ages. "Let the truth prevail though the heavens fall." "Buy the truth and sell it not." "The truth is always right," said Sophocles; and John Locke wrote: "To love truth for truth's sake is the principal part of human perfection in this world, and the seed-plot of all other virtues." Truth is especially binding upon us in this discussion of religion and science, both of which are professedly committed to truth, and most of all upon the followers of him who declared, "I am the truth."

This general principle may now be unfolded into several subordinate points and applications. In all our studies and discussions we should endeavor to perceive reality as it is, as little distorted and discolored as possible with our own personal purposes and prejudices. Of course, we must conduct all our reasoning on the basis of our accepted general principles and we cannot wholly escape our preconceived theories and unconscious preferences. We necessarily see things, as we have before remarked, not only as they are, but also as we are, through our own minds and moods. Yet we can watch our mental processes and keep them as free as possible from subjective perversion. Partisanship is highly and cunningly selective and picks out the facts and features in the scene that fit into the picture we want to paint; but we can cultivate and exercise the dispassionate mind that strives to look steadily at reality and see it as it is.

It is next of primary importance that we state things as they are. Inaccuracy, exaggeration, misleading statements, misrepresentation, false imputations of meanings and motives, calling opprobrious names, and all modes and degrees of untruth are to be excluded from our discussion as unethical and gravely wrong. We owe it to ourselves and to our fellow men that we be strictly honest and honorable, candid and charitable, just and chivalrous in all our relations with them.

This applies to our statements of the position of others and of the contents of books and to our quotations from them. It is possible and easy to select fragmentary quotations torn from their context

so as to misrepresent the author or even to make it out that he is supporting one side of a debated question when he is actually supporting the other. Even the Bible can be quoted as saying, "There is no God."

Another form of misrepresentation in controversy is for one disputant to draw inferences from the positions and opinions of another and then attribute them to his opponent as though they were his own, thus mixing up his own inferences with his opponent's facts. No one has a right to do this and in so doing one may tell a positive untruth. A disputant may say that in his judgment an opponent on the basis of his admitted position should draw certain inferences and hold them, but he has no right to impute these to him as though they were his own. It is simple truth and fairness never to ascribe to a man a position or opinion which he does not himself accept.

4. Concerning the Use and Abuse of Names

Language is a necessary means of human thought and communication. Words give shape and sharp outline to our ideas and enable us to form and work with them and then express and impart them to others. Without words our thinking would fall to a low level not much above that of beasts. "To speak," said Max Müller, "is to think aloud, and to think is to speak low." Only rudimentary and rude images would float around in a consciousness that had no definite word molds in which to cast and fix and label and identify them.

Words, then, necessarily enter into the very substance of our thought and measure the width and depth of our thinking. Yet words are also attended with limitations and dangers and are occasions and means of endless misunderstandings and perversions of thought, and give birth to swarms of manifold kinds of errors. They can not only tell the truth but can also and equally utter untruths and tell lies. They can set ideas in windows that are clear glass and let truth shine through as unobstructed sunlight, or they can dim and color and distort the glass so that it clouds or stains or perverts the truth. They may issue as clear sparkling streams

or as muddy currents. In fact, words are only cunning tools which a bad man can use as effectively as a good man. And without such evil intent one who is seeking to find and express the truth may yet be misled by the very words he uses into wrong concepts or into obscurity or perverted thought and expression that not only mislead others but also confuse himself. Many, if not most, of the misunderstandings and controversies and strained relations among men arise out of the very language they use. Industrial disputes are intensified, political issues and discussions are perverted, theological differences are widened and embittered, national and international affairs are distorted and inflamed, wars are kindled and empires slain, history is troubled and the whole world disturbed and distressed by this partisanship and perversion of language. And so it would appear that, as Talleyrand said, language is devised to conceal rather than to reveal thought.

These disadvantages and evils, however, that are inwrought in the texture of language are such as inhere in all things human and are due to limitations and imperfections that cannot be wholly eliminated or avoided. Notwithstanding the imperfections and evils connected with words, we must have and use them, and what we should do is to seek to reduce to the lowest limits these imperfections and make our words fit our ideas as closely as possible; and the chief means by which we are to do this is to strive to exercise the spirit of clarity and candor and honesty in thought and expression. The scientific spirit of truth-seeking is the root of clear and exact and honest words.

Words vary in meaning so that the same word may carry many meanings, so simple a word as "line" having in the *English Historical Dictionary* no fewer than thirty-nine different significations. This fact is in itself one of the most prolific sources of misunderstanding and controversy. The disputants using the same words in different senses miss and pass one another. Sometimes controversialists charge their opponents with using words of established usage in a peculiar sense of their own and may even allege that they are doing this with intentional deception. The orthodox may charge that the heterodox are using orthodox terms to cover up their heresy. If this is ever done, it is a reprehensible practice.

We ought to use words in their generally accepted sense, or else make plain the special sense in which we are using them.

Yet the case is not so simple as it may seem. Words are not fixed finalities as though they were fossilized into rigid stone, but they are living and growing things that are steadily undergoing changes. Old words cannot remain fixed in a changing world, but must keep pace with the growing thoughts and experience of men. The widening sea of knowledge and the increasing Christian experience and consciousness of the age overflow the old shores and pour into the little inlets and pools of individual words fuller and richer contents. Words undergo climatic changes, and these are slow and insensible, but they are inescapable and in time they add up into differences so great that the original meanings are lost and the old forms carry new senses.

Men, then, have a right to express their growing faith in the old forms, pouring the new wine into old vessels. No man or party has a patent on words or monopoly of them so as to restrict them to his own meaning and use. He is himself using them in senses that have been modified and he must let this process go on. Only when an old word is used in a new sense, the new meaning should be a logical outgrowth and application of the old.

A use of words that involves us in no small amount of our controversial troubles is using them as party names and then fastening them on opponents as a means of raising prejudice against them. This is a favorite device in many fields, especially in politics and religion. This use of names may be just a way of branding a man with a false designation or of condemning him without trial, for when a man is thus classified and tagged he is at once misjudged and set in a false light by those who do not know the truth about him. This may be simply a way of giving a dog a bad name and then beating him with any stick. Sometimes these labels used opprobriously are hurled at one another by heated controversialists as though they were "swear words," or they are used as quarreling boys call one another bad names. "If the devil," says Dean Inge, "invented partisan labels—and I think he must have done so—it was one of the cleverest tricks he ever played." Wherefore, "Speak ye every man the truth with his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates: and let none of you devise evil in

your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, saith Jehovah."

5. Fundamentalism and Modernism

Among the party names in current use in the religious world are the older terms "conservative" and "liberal" and the newer terms "fundamentalist" and "modernist," and these call for special definition and consideration. The older and the newer contrasted pairs of terms are not quite coextensive in meaning. The first two are predominantly intellectualistic and refer mainly to attitudes towards doctrines and policies, and the latter two are broader in scope and take in all experience. Frequently, however, they are practically synonymous.

All of these names are true and good in their etymological and proper sense, and any clear-thinking man may justly claim his right to all of them in some form and degree. And yet they all have been perverted and poisoned by partisan disputants and they are used as a means of hurling mutual charges and recriminations in theological controversies. This is petty, if not unethical, business. Do not each and all of these names embody important aspects of truth? The "conservative" is one who appreciates and seeks to conserve the truth and good he has received from the past, and this is vitally necessary to the very existence of our life. The "liberal," however, perceives that truth is a growing process and product and he means to keep his mind open and free towards its widening horizons and to welcome all new truth. This, also, is not less vitally important than the principle of conservatism. The two principles are equally necessary and are the centripetal and the centrifugal tendencies and movements of the mind. The one places stronger emphasis on the past and clings to its center, and the other looks to the future and sweeps out into broader orbits. The one fixes attention chiefly on the seed, and the other on the fruit. The one is intent on keeping what it has, and the other is seeking to increase its store. Of course, these two principles cannot be wholly divorced and are present in varying degrees in every mind. The problem is how to balance them in proper proportion, and the way in which each one

does this will designate and classify him as a conservative or a liberal.

The terms fundamentalism and modernism are not only newer but also broader and more significant, and these call for further description and differentiation.

(1) *What Is Fundamentalism?* In some quarters this word is opprobriously associated with ignorance, but in its proper sense it bears no such implication. Fundamentalism means that the foundations of truth and life are of primary importance and that we should above all things see and seize these and guard them well. In this sense all will agree to accept the principle, for essentially fundamentalism is a principle and method and not a doctrine. It asserts the primary importance of fundamental facts and principles, but does not in itself decide what these fundamentals are. At this point, however, arises the critical problem and process of determining what are the fundamentals or most essential truths and what are truths at all, and this involves us in difference of view and controversy. In fact every man, however radical he may be, is a fundamentalist, only he wants to select his own fundamentals. Fundamentalists do not at all agree as to what the fundamentals, even their own fundamentals, are; and they may disagree widely and even violently. Certain doctrines and attitudes have become associated with fundamentalism which most of the men of this group hold, and the same is true of modernism, but it would be difficult to state these on the one or the other side so as to win general acceptance. It is the principles, however, of these two systems and not their associated doctrines or the results of their application with which we are concerned.[3]

(2) *What Is Modernism?* The word modernism (akin to the Latin *modo,* meaning "just now") is defined by Webster as "a modern usage, mode of expression, or characteristic; modern quality or character." However, it has acquired a definite almost technical meaning in a theological sense, and it is a vital point in

[3] These two principles are not properly logical contrasts. The opposite of fundamentalism, as John Dewey has pointed out, is not modernism but incidentalism; and the opposite of modernism is not fundamentalism but medievalism. Popular usage, however, commonly views the two terms as being in contrast.

this discussion that we understand and always keep in mind this meaning. The word has acquired in some quarters a sinister sound and sense because opponents have imputed to it and associated with it meanings and implications which do not belong to it in its etymology and origin and in its usage by those who hold its true principle and repudiate these false associations. We therefore give a number of definitions of the term as used by authoritative writers.

"Modernism is the name given by a papal encyclical,[4] which condemned it, to a complex of movements within the Roman Communion, all alike inspired by the desire to bring the tradition of Christian belief and practice into closer relation with the intellectual habits and social aspirations of our own times."[5]

Father George Tyrrell, one of the initiators of the movement in the Roman Catholic Church, defines it: "By a modernist I mean a churchman of any sort who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of Modernity."[6] Albert Houdin in his *History of Catholic Modernism* defines it: "The desire of adapting religion to the social, moral, and intellectual needs of the times; and if the word employed to designate it is not very ancient, it at least represents the eternal conflict between the spirit of progress and the spirit of inertia, between those who make religion a formula and those for whom it is life itself."[7] Dr. William Sanday, who may be taken as speaking for English modernism and also English scholarship, says: "I do not disclaim the name Modernist. The name describes justly

---

[4] *Pascendi Dominici* by Pope Pius X in 1907.

[5] A. L. Lilley, in his article on "Modernism" in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.* The article gives a good account of the history and outcome of the movement in the Roman Catholic Church. It began in France with Alfred Loïsy, a young Professor of Hebrew in the Catholic Institute of Paris, and in England with Father George Tyrrell, a member of the Society of Jesus, and spread into Germany and Italy. It was finally condemned and suppressed in the Roman Catholic Church so far as papal authority and punishment could do this, but it is still fermenting under the surface.

[6] Quoted in *The Modern Churchman* for June, 1922.

[7] Quoted in the article on "Modernism" in the *New International Encyclopædia.*

what I aim at being. I aim at thinking the thoughts and speaking the language of my own day, and yet at the same time keeping all that is essential in the religion of the past." Again he wrote: "If it be said that what I have written is Modernism, I would reply that I believe—I emphatically and hopefully believe—that a sound and right Modernism is really possible; that the Saviour of mankind extends His Arms towards the cultivated modern man, just as much as He does towards the simple believer. I believe that the cultivated modern man may enter the Church of Christ with his head erect—with some changes of language due to difference of times, but of the nature of reinterpretation of old truths, and without real equivocation of heart." And again he wrote: "Modernism stands fundamentally for what I have called elsewhere 'the unification of thought'. The Liberal feels that he cannot stop short of this. It is the same mind that has to think of things secular and of things sacred, and the processes of thinking for both are the same."[8] Rev. Dr. W. M. Pryke says: "The modern apologetic arises primarily from an intense conviction that the best thought of the age must be unified if Christianity is to retain its hold on the modern mind."[9] Dr. Newman Smyth defined it: "Modernism is a certain attitude of mind corresponding to our times: it is a tendency of thought rather than a body of doctrine: a vitalizing spirit making all things new, rather than a full-grown complete theology; an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed."[10] Dean Shailer Mathews defines it: "It is the use of the methods of modern science to find, state and use the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy in meeting the needs of the modern world."[11] Dr. J. M. Sterret in his *Modernism in Religion* says: "A Christian modernist is one who is heir to all the ages, but feels that he should not be a slave to any one of them." And he also says that modernism is a desire "to live and get others to live in better harmony with our present universe of thought."

---

[8] These quotations from Sanday are found in W. M. Pryke's *Modernism as a Working Faith*, pp. 4-5.

[9] *Modernism as a Working Faith*, p. 13.

[10] See his Autobiography, *Recollections and Reflections*, for a chapter on the subject.

[11] *The Faith of Modernism*, p. 23.

All these definitions reflect the attitude and spirit of Paul: "Forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:14); and also are in accordance with his admonition: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (I Thes. 5:21).

The modernist is thus one who endeavors to bring all his knowledge up to date and adjust it to the thought and life of to-day. He is one who has been born in and inherited an old house, an ancient palace or castle that is a composite structure planned and built and from time to time enlarged and improved by many architects and builders through many centuries and inhabited successively by many generations of ancestors. But he finds it out of date and unsuited to his use and convenience and comfort, and so he sets about modernizing it. He fills up its useless moat, removes its obsolete drawbridge, fits up for other use its abandoned dungeon with its instruments of torture, abhorrent reminders and relics of the cruelty of other days, and repairs and renovates it throughout. He installs modern sanitary plumbing and heating and lighting apparatus, redecorates its halls and rooms, supplies them with new furniture and upholstery, fills the library with new books, and thus transforms the old fortress into a modern mansion. He keeps the old in so far as it is good, especially its solid ancient foundations and walls, and yet makes it new, combining the best of the past with the improvements of the present. Or like the "Chambered Nautilus," which may be taken as a description of the principle of modernism as true as it is beautiful, he keeps moving out of the old and narrow shell into new and more spacious and beautiful chambers which grow out of and yet remain in connection with the old and afford an ampler and richer life. Or, to change the figure again, he does not cling to an old stump, though it once bore a tree that served him well, when nearby is a living, shade-giving, fruit-bearing tree that waits to welcome and shelter and feed him.

Modernism is thus a principle and a method and not a doctrine. As the higher criticism is a method of studying the Scriptures and is not to be identified with any particular conclusion of such study, so modernism is a principle and spirit and is not to be confused with any particular result and doctrine, such as inspiration,

miracle, or the Virgin Birth of our Lord. There are modernists who do reject the supernatural in all its forms, but this is the result of their application of the principle of modernism and is not the principle itself; and there are other modernists who accept the supernatural in its thorough-going sense, and this also is the result of their application of the principle and is not the principle itself. It is vital to any proper discussion of this subject that we keep the principle of modernism apart from the results of its application by different students; and the same is true of fundamentalism.

When, then, modernism is identified with "naturalism" or "scepticism" or "agnosticism" or any form of infidelity, this is to confuse the issue by imputing a sinister meaning to the word that modernists themselves repudiate.

We, then, adopt as our definition of modernism and the sense in which we use it throughout this discussion the following: *Modernism is the principle and progressive process of continually unifying our growing experience in knowledge and life.*

This principle is not at all peculiar to or confined within the field of religion but is of universal application. It is constantly working in science and industry, literature and art, government and society, and is simply the necessary process by which every field of truth and experience must keep harmonizing its results with itself and with all other fields of life. Any science or art affords illustrations of it. Our national constitution is a striking illustration of modernism as we have repeatedly revised and enlarged it, both by amendment and by interpretation, incorporating in it such immense expansions of its principles as the abolition of slavery, the prohibition of the liquor traffic and the extension of the franchise to women, and thus bringing it up to date in harmony with our broadening knowledge and growing national experience. The passage from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican astronomy was the most stupendous instance of modernism that has occurred in human history. And this transition is still going on, for Newton's law of gravity now appears to be passing, in harmony with wider induction and larger experience, into Einstein's relativity, and thus Newton is being modernized and brought up to date. Enough has been said to suggest, and volumes might be written to show,

how universal and infinitely prolific and fruitful in all fields are the principle and process of modernism.

(3) *Fundamentalism and Modernism Compared.* We may now bring these two principles issuing in two schools or attitudes of thought and life into comparison so as to bring out more fully their nature. We may first note their agreements, which are immensely greater and more vital than their differences.

Fundamentalism and modernism are both principles and processes and not results and doctrines. They are both true principles and necessary processes and can no more be stopped than can the activity and growth of the human mind.

Fundamentalists and modernists may be equally intelligent and sincere, conscientious and honest. They may both be seeking truth and right and following it as they find it. They may both be assumed to be Christians. Modernists are in all our Protestant churches in growing numbers and many of them are eminent Christian and evangelical scholars, theologians and scientists, and their evangelical faith and faithfulness are not to be denied or doubted. Fundamentalists, of course, as a class freely admit this, but an occasional extreme and fanatical one does deny it and thereby assumes the rôle of the Pharisee.

Both fundamentalists and modernists in our Protestant communions hold to the real fundamentals or essential facts and faith of historic Christianity. These are the personality and Fatherhood of God, the deity and Saviourhood of Christ, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the spiritual revelation and authority of the Word of God. These deep broad unities in these two schools or groups are vastly more vital than their superficial divergencies.

Both fundamentalism and modernism, or conservatism and liberalism, have an immense amount of achievement to their credit. Conservatism lays claim to our whole vast inheritance which it seeks to keep and guard. It already has won and secured the primary elements and necessities of our human world and therefore now has more to its credit in the present than progress can ever win in the future. The simple elementary things, that are necessarily discovered early, are usually vastly more useful and important than their later complex developments. Wheat and corn are more vital to our welfare than strawberries and cream, and plain

bread and butter than rich pastries. The oldest inventions are still by far the most useful. The plow and the loom are more useful than the self-binding reaper and the locomotive, and the common road than the railway. If we had to surrender either the common hammer or the printing press, we would better give up the printing press and keep the hammer, for hammers make printing presses, but printing presses cannot make hammers and cannot be made without them.

On the other hand, progress puts in its claim. It may even claim all that conservatism keeps, because the store of conservatism was accumulated by progress. It was progress in the past that filled the storehouse of conservatism so full. Were progress to stop, our whole vast inheritance would begin to decline and decay and would crumble back into the primary elements from which progress developed it. Both of these principles and processes are necessary and neither may say to the other, "I have no need of thee." They are related as hand and foot, the hand to get and the foot to get forward. They are twin forces and mutually dependent coworkers and neither can do its work or survive without the coöperation of the other. Conservatism is the root, and progress is the fruit. Conservatism is the gun compressing the exploding powder, and progress is the bullet speeding to its mark. Conservatism is the water behind the ship against which the propeller revolves, and progress is the sharp prow cleaving the water in front into spray and foam to let the ship slip through. Conservatism and progress are wedded in indissoluble union in the very constitution of the universe and what God hath joined together let not man put asunder.

Since underneath their differences there are deeper unities common to fundamentalists and modernists, they should live and work in mutual confidence and coöperation. Neither should seek to exclude the other from common fellowship and church membership, but they should stay together. The contention that "they cannot live together" flies in the face of all Christian faith and charity and Scripture. They always have existed and always will exist side by side in the same church. Separation whether by voluntary withdrawal or ecclesiastical discipline would not solve or help the situation, but would only make matters worse and would open a wound

for the next generation to heal, with nothing gained and much lost. If the two parties were separated, these differences would spring up in each group, and the fundamentalists would quickly breed their own modernists, and the modernists would have their fundamentalists and the last state would be worse than the first. They should both abide in the same house, for there is room and need for both.

They need each other as mutual limitations and checks. If either overbalanced the other the result would be disastrous to truth and goodness. Unchecked liberalism might sweep beyond the borders of soberness and sanity, and unstimulated conservatism might slow down into stagnation and death. They should strive to exercise mutual understanding and patience and sympathy and carry on their common work. Though the fundamentalists may be grieved and think that modernism is a poisonous plant and that they are called upon to root it up, and though modernists may think that fundamentalism is a pestiferous weed, yet both should be permitted to grow together lest in pulling up the tares the wheat be rooted up also. Let both grow together until the harvest of the future sifts the truth from the error and even tares may be transformed into good grain.

Let it be noted and emphasized that neither fundamentalism nor modernism can guarantee the truth of its conclusions. They are both principles and methods, and any principle, however sound it may be, does not insure the correctness of its applications. Even the exact and certain principles of mathematics do not certify the accuracy of our sums in addition, much less of our higher mathematical calculations. As higher criticism is a principle and process which does not always reach truth and has often fallen into error, so is it with these principles. Modernism has made mistakes, and so has fundamentalism, and so will they surely do again. But this fallibility of the process does not justify us in mistrusting and refusing to use the principle: it should only make us more careful in applying it. When we find a mistake in our mathematical calculations we do not renounce and denounce the multiplication table: we simply go over our figures again with closer attention. The duty of seeking the truth remains in full force, whatever mistakes have been made; and we can seek and find the truth only as we take account of all facts and kinds of knowledge

and fuse them into unity according to our best light and judgment, and this is the principle of modernism.

To conclude on the use of these names and labels, I make bold to adopt every one of them in its proper sense, refusing to be alarmed at a label, but I will not accept one of them and will resent all of them when another man puts into them his own misleading and unfair interpretation and then in this sense tries to fasten them on me. I am a "conservative" in the sense that I try to see and seize and keep all the truth and good I have inherited and that I have obtained in my own experience. But I am not a "conservative" in the sense that I am blindly committed to tradition and am standing still in the midst of modern progress. I am a "liberal" in the sense that I claim and exercise the liberty of doing my own thinking and of keeping pace with all the widening thoughts of men. But I am not a "liberal" in the sense that I am a radical freethinker, regarding no confessional limits and obligations. I am a "fundamentalist" in the sense that I hold to the real fundamentals of theistic philosophy and evangelical Christianity, but I will choose my own fundamentals and not allow another man to impose his upon me; and I am not a fundamentalist in the sense that I am an ignorant and bigoted obscurantist. I am a "modernist" in the sense that I am not a medievalist or an antediluvian. I live in the modern world, eat its food, speak its language, share in its inheritance and try to march with its thought. I am a "modernist" in the true sense that I try to bring all my knowledge up to date and unify my total experience. But I am not a "modernist" in the sense that I am an "agnostic modernist" or a "pragmatic skeptic," or that as Presbyterian minister in good standing I hold to "another religion." Along with Dr. Francis L. Patton, "Speaking for myself I confess that I do not wear either of these labels, for I am enough of a modernist to feel that I have a right to live in the twentieth century and too much of a fundamentalist to renounce my heritage of faith for the sake of being in fashionable company."[12] I try to be all of these things in so far as they are true and none of them in so far as they are wrong. And I wish to give every other man the same right, calling him by no name

[12] *Fundamental Christianity*, p. 2.

which he does not accept and imputing to the name he adopts no opprobrious meaning of my own, and hoping that he will return the compliment.

The general outcome of our introductory discussion is that our goal is truth and that truth is many-sided and complex and that equally intelligent and honest thinkers may differ and that there should be mutual respect and fairness and courtesy among those who seek reality in the fields of old faith and new knowledge. It may be that this method and spirit of discussion is a counsel of perfection, but this aim is the ideal of both religion and science and has ancient authority. A Hebrew king said unto a prophet, "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou speak unto me nothing but the truth?" The spirit of truth-seeking is the dominant ideal and demand of our day and in this discussion let us strive to conform to this standard.

CHAPTER II

RELIGION

It will be in order, before undertaking to bring religion and science into harmonious adjustment, to take a general view of these fields so as to determine their respective nature and limits. Of course this can be done in this connection only in the most summary way.

1. Faith and Religion Defined

Let us begin with defining faith as the chief element in and faculty and means of our religious life, and then proceed to unfold the nature of religion.

(1) *Faith* is trust or confidence primarily in a person and may then be extended to a principle or thing. It is based upon or grows out of some knowledge of or dependence upon its object. Faith, then, is a constitutional and fundamental, primary and universal, ground of knowledge and action. By far the largest part of our knowledge rests on this ground. All the knowledge we derive from others, whether through speech or writings, is faith because it rests on confidence in them. Our daily life is carried on by faith, we walk by faith, says Paul, and we could not enter into any social relation and could hardly take a single step without it. Faith is thus the common ground on which we walk and the atmosphere we breathe. It is the common bond of society, the loom that weaves us into one web of social life. Without faith we would all fall apart and quickly perish.

Only a small fraction of our knowledge is the product of our personal sense perception and logical demonstration, for we derive the greater part of it from teachers and books and other social sources. Not only do uneducated people thus learn and live by

faith, but this is just as true of scholars, scientists and philosophers. Each one of these investigates only his own little area of knowledge at first hand, and then he derives all his other knowledge at second hand from experts in other fields.

We must extend our dependence on faith into deeper matters. We must trust our mental processes in order that we may gain any knowledge whatsoever. Even biologically the heart is older than the brain, which means that feeling is deeper than reason, instinct than intelligence. We must trust something before we can know anything, and thus all our knowledge is the child of our faith. All our logical processes begin in the middle of things and are thus grounded in faith at both ends. Reason plays a relatively small and often unimportant part in determining our beliefs and actions. "Man is endowed with reason," says Benjamin Franklin in his autobiography, "in order that he may give reasons for what he wants to do." Feeling and faith, instinct and desire have largely settled the matter before reason arrives on the field. We do not believe our fundamental principles because we prove them, but we prove them because we believe them. Faith is constitutional in us and rules us even when we are largely unconscious of its presence and power.

This does not mean, however, that faith is mere feeling or blind impulse, for this would reduce any form of faith to irrationality and superstition. In the infant faith is a pure instinct, but in mature life it must come up into full consciousness and live in its light. Faith is itself a kind of knowledge, but it is knowledge based upon and shot through with trust in a person. Though at first the heart may have reasons, as Pascal said, which reason does not know, yet sooner or later it must answer at the bar of reason and give logical grounds for its trust. Our faith in a person is always based upon knowledge of him that justifies it. Faith is not a state and activity of any single faculty of the mind, but it involves thought and feeling and will and is the combined activity of the total personality.

Faith is therefore a progressive and dynamic force. As it shares in all the knowledge of the mind it must keep pace with it. Though at times it may drag behind and even be hostile to growing knowledge, yet sooner or later it must be adjusted into harmony with the

total contents of the soul. Not only so, but faith is also prophetic and often sees far ahead of the intellect and catches visions of creative ideals that will in time turn to victories that will shape the centuries. It was by faith that Abraham followed the gleam of the one true and living God and Moses delivered his people out of the bondage of Egypt and Paul carried the torch of the gospel from Asia into Europe and Columbus every morning kept the prow of his ship in the track of the sun and every evening drove it deeper into the dark and Lincoln wrote the Emancipation Proclamation. Faith has starred the pages of history with glorious visions and victories and rolled the world through the shadows of the night into the morning. And so it is not static and stagnant but dynamic and progressive. It is not backward- but forward-looking and the light of the future is in its eyes.

Faith is a step into the unseen and implies some risk and courage. It is often an adventure that tries the soul and turns its trial into triumph. Were it possible to take all faith out of our life and reduce it all to sight and certainty, we would thereby level the heights of aspiration and inspiration, sweep all visions out of our sky and lower life to a dull routine of mechanism and drudgery. The power of faith is one of the chief marks of the greatness of man. The animal has no factor of faith and hope in its instinctive life, "the present only toucheth it," but man faces the unknown future that is the field of his problems and perils and possibilities, the ocean on which his "purpose holds to sail beyond the sunset, and the baths of all the western stars." There would be no venture and courage in a world without faith. Death itself gains infinite interest and worth from the fact that it is faith's sublimest adventure. The world owes more than it can tell or know to faith, even to religious faith. This point is not to be forgotten in the later discussion of our subject as the impression is sometimes entertained and even asserted that religious faith has been nothing but an enemy of knowledge and a drag upon the wheels of progress.

We must extend our faith out through the world to the confines of the universe as an orderly and rational system of reality, for such an assumption is the very ground and possibility of science and yet this assumption is an act of faith, for it is quite beyond the range of our sense perception and logical demonstration and

always will be. The scientist starts with faith both in himself and in the world. "As for the strong conviction," says Huxley, "that the cosmic order is rational, and the faith that, throughout all durations, unbroken order has reigned in the universe, I not only accept it, but I am disposed to think it the most important of all truths." See how confidently he accepts and asserts the rationality of the universe, and yet he does this as an act of pure faith. In this extension of our faith into the universe we have not departed from our definition of it as trust in a person, for in the exercise of such faith we tacitly assume that the universe is rational on the ground that it is a tissue of intellectual relations and bears the marks of mind and is the product of a trustworthy person.

Faith is older than logical or scientific knowledge because men had to live by instinctive faith in one another and in nature and in God before they could begin the logical study of these objects or even become conscious of intellectual questions about them. The little child lives unquestioningly and beautifully by faith and only gradually advances into the processes of intellectual knowledge through the years, and thus it reproduces the experience of the race. Men may come to develop logical knowledge in time, but they must trust much at once in order to live at all. Science is a late comer into the world and a recent achievement of the race and of the individual, but trust developed in the race as a necessary instinct and as the vital breath of men in the earliest beginning. The faith by which we live, then, is the oldest and deepest and most universal and vital element of our life. Science cannot disparage it as a lower and less trustworthy kind of knowledge, much less as a mere traditional or illegitimate or superstitious way of believing, for it is itself a child of faith and in its home and atmosphere lives and moves and has its being.

Faith is predominantly the appropriating and receptive faculty of the mind. It is the assimilative power of the soul by which it absorbs truth and values and soaks up life from other lives. Faith in any person commits and binds us to him so that we are identified with him and all that he is becomes available for us. When we give ourselves into the care of a physician all his knowledge and skill is put at our service and is more efficient for our healing than if we had it in our own selves. The soldier trusting his general shares

in and is guided and armed by all the superior knowledge and training of the officer. A nation is as wise as its statesmen and as strong as its army. The scholar has at his service all the knowledge of the teacher; and, most beautiful of all, the child by its faith in its father and mother shares in and is guided and trained and strengthened by all that they are and have. Faith thus so merges us with the person on whom our faith rests that we are one with him in all that he is. A fundamental law of life is: "Have faith in your father and mother and you will be saved in your childhood; Have faith in your teacher and you will be taught; Have faith in your physician and you will be healed." In the most literal sense we walk by faith, we live by faith, and by faith are we saved.

The faith of common life runs up through the spiritual life and becomes religious faith. It is important that we see that religious faith is not a peculiar kind of trust different from that which we exercise in the home and business and society, but is just our ordinary and general faith carried up into a higher field and application. Religion in general is not a foreign importation into this world, a pilgrim and alien among us wearing a strange garb and speaking a foreign language, as it is sometimes represented to be, but it is just our human life raised to a higher degree of development and power. All the principles of our daily life and the very laws of nature itself find fuller and finer expression in our religious life, so that religion should wear the same garb and speak the same language as our daily walk and conversation. Religion is not a strange foreign plant in our world, but it is at home in its own soil and climate in this world and should here come to its full flower and fruit.

(2) *Religion.* We are now in a position to see the nature of religion. Religion is faith carried from our earthly up to our heavenly Father and is *our conscious relation to God.* The many-sided human soul has various capacities of reaction to the many-sided world of its environment. In its reaction to the factual existence and relations of the world it experiences truth; to the esthetic aspect of the world it experiences beauty; to the moral nature of the world it experiences its sense of duty; and in its relation to God it experiences religion. This puts it in logical

line with all our other experiences and gives it its proper and inexpugnable place in our world and life.

Definitions of religion are many, "a thousand" it has been said, and it may be difficult to frame one that includes all forms of it. Being the life of the spirit, it is largely spiritual in nature and cannot be caught and confined in an iron cage or mold of words. Many students and thinkers have worked out definitions and they have varied from the most traditional and orthodox concepts of God to religion as "a beautiful gesture to the universe." Herbert Spencer resolved religion into the sense of mystery we experience in the presence of the Unknowable Power in which we are environed and which wells up within us; John Morley found in it "the feeling for the incommensurable things"; Edward Caird said "a man's religion is the expression of his attitude towards the universe"; J. R. Seeley found in it our "permanent and habitual admiration," and Matthew Arnold defined it as "morality touched with emotion." Schleiermacher found the essential element of religion to consist in "a feeling of dependence," and William James, in his *Varieties of Religious Experience,* sums up the results of his wide investigation with the conclusion: "There is a certain uniform deliverance in which religions all appear to meet. It consists of two parts: 1. An uneasiness; and 2. Its solution. (*a*) The uneasiness reduced to its simplest terms is a sense that there is *something wrong about us* as we naturally stand. (*b*) The solution is a sense that *we are saved from the wrongness* by making proper connection with the higher powers." Dr. J. G. Frazer's elaborate studies extending to twelve volumes in *The Golden Bough* lead him to the conclusion that religion is "a propitiation or conciliation of powers supreme to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life." All these definitions, which might be indefinitely multiplied, involve as their root and germ the principle that religion is our conscious relation to God.

Religion is, therefore, a life of faith in and fellowship with God and not simply a creed or confession of faith or theological system. Theology and religion are related as a science and its corresponding art, theology being the science of religion and religion the art of theology. The one is an intellectual construction and the other a

practical application in character and life. However, religion may be used in the broad sense of including theology, and it is so used in this chapter. Religion is related to our common life as the sky is related to the landscape, pouring down upon it the sunshine and shower that clothe it with verdure and cause it to spring into bloom and fruitage. Being a spirit of life, religion is pervasive of all our life, controlling and molding and transfiguring it with the indwelling Spirit of God. Ideally, no part of our life, secret thought or public activity, can escape its purifying and transforming presence and power. It envelops and permeates our life as the atmosphere the earth and the sunlight the day. It gives meaning to our life, lifting it into divine worth and touching it with eternal issues. It undergirds our life with strength and inspires it with vision and courage that carry it as on wings into a victorious life. It satisfies the deepest longings of the soul for heavenly guidance and comfort and hope and answers the age-long desire of humanity, "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." It is the cry of the soul, "O God, thou hast made us for thyself and we cannot rest until we rest in thee." It sets the whole world with all its sins and sorrows in the light of God's love and knows that the Judge of all the earth will do right and cause all things to work together for good to them that love Him.

2. The Roots of Religion

The nature of religion will be further unfolded as we study its roots.

(1) *Historical Roots of Religion.* The historical roots of religion have generated endless controversy and variety of theories. Its origin has been mixed up with magic and fetishism and ancestor worship and other primitive superstitions. There has been much digging in the subsoil and slime of savagery and in the ashes of archeology, especially in the fear of demons with which primitive men believed the world to be thickly infested, waiting and watching to entrap them. This view filled the world with terror, making every forest and mountain and stream and sea an object of dire dread. Men thought to propitiate these evil demons by incantations

and sacrifices and other forms of worship, and thus arose the whole brood of religions. Thus religion has been connected with ignoble origins and the impression has been given that it would disappear as these superstitions fade away under the light of civilization. But the true nature of a tree is better seen in its blossoms and fruit than in its gnarled roots buried in the earth; and the true nature of religion is properly seen in its highest and purest forms. And so far from dying out, religion grows with all the growth of man and blooms into its finest blossoms and ripens into its best fruit in the highest civilization. There is some element of truth in all these theories, but the full truth is much wider and deeper than these roots, for religion is grounded in every part of our nature.

(2) *Our Constitutional Intuitions.* Religion is rooted in our constitutional intuitions and instincts and is a practical need and necessity of our life. It appeared from the beginning universally in the world, no nation or tribe having been found that did not manifest it in some form; and it did not appear as a conscious creation or product of thought, but as an instinctive and necessary activity of the human soul. Men did not study theology and then become religious, but they lived religiously and then studied theology. Man had a religious nature which immediately impelled him to a religious life, just as he had a physical and mental and social nature unconsciously urging him to live a physical and mental and social life. As men lived in the sunlight ages before they studied astronomy and cultivated the soil long before they studied agriculture, so they worshiped God ages before they so much as thought about theology. The religious nature is just as ineradicable in man as his mental or physical, and therefore he is naturally and necessarily and incurably religious.

(3) *In the Feelings.* Religion is rooted in the feelings. The feelings are the deepest if not the oldest constituent of the soul. Religion ramifies the feelings in six forms: fear, wonder, dependence, value, obligation, and beauty. *Fear* is a constitutional emotion which is one of the safeguards of life, and it runs up from our physical through our mental and moral life to our spiritual life and finds its highest expression in the fear of the Lord. Filial fear is not a low but a noble motive and is a true strand that binds us to God.

Wonder is a profound sense of the majesty and mystery of the Power that produces all these glittering constellations as the sparkling dew of its breath; and this feeling never can be explained away or outgrown, as all our growth in knowledge only makes the mystery deeper and vaster. Such wonder is akin to worship and will ever be another strand that draws and binds us to God.

Dependence is a deep root of religion. The babe is the most beautiful instance of dependence in the world. It is nourished and cared for by the mother and would quickly perish if cut off from such care. We never outgrow such dependence, but it literally grows with all our growth. Life ever increases in complexity by which we are brought into dependence upon an ever-wider environment, and this irresistibly leads us to an ultimate point of dependence, a Power that is itself independent of all change, a Rock that is higher than we, an infinite and eternal God.

Our sense of *value* is incomplete and unsatisfied until we find a final standard and perfect embodiment of worth. Finite and temporal worth loses its chief value if there is no absolute and eternal worth of which it is a faint copy and on which it depends for its permanent worth and sanction. Our worship is our sense of the worthship of God, the words being only slightly different spellings of the same root, and any sense of worth in the world is a stepping-stone up to the high altar of the supreme worthship or worship of God.

Our feeling of *obligation* is another direct stepping-stone to the same altar. The feeling that we ought to obey truth and right means that we owe this obedience, and duty is that which is due. We cannot owe anything to a blind law or impersonal Power, but only to a moral Lawgiver and Person. There is a person at one end of this ethical relation and duty, and there must equally be a Person at the other end, or this powerful chain that binds us is suspended on nothing, as though the gravitation that holds the earth in its orbit were at the other end left hanging unsupported and loose in space, instead of being rooted in the sun. Conscience is a powerful witness to a supreme Lawgiver and Lord and cries out with all its might that "we ought to obey God rather than men."

Our sense of *beauty* or esthetic nature is another path by which feeling finds God. The sense of beauty within us is waked into music by the beauty without us, that tunes the million-stringed harp of nature into a grand cosmic orchestra that plays upon us and stirs us with strange mystic feelings that are too deep for tears. So also nature carves and paints the world and drenches it with beauty down to its very atoms. The eye sees and the heart feels only what corresponds with the nature of the soul, and therefore our esthetic nature finds in the world an artistic essence and nature which can only be the product and expression of an infinite Artist.

Thus our emotions in various forms feel after God if haply they may find him; and they do find that he is "not far from any one of us." As long as feeling endures as a constituent element of the human soul religion will endure and men will worship.

(4) *In the Intellect.* Religion is also rooted in the intellect. Man is a thinker and cannot keep his brain from sprouting. As the instincts find God as the satisfaction of their practical needs, and the feelings find him as the appropriate object of their craving, so the intellect finds God as the result of its search. It rationalizes and illuminates and confirms all these instinctive and emotional grounds and impulses of religious faith, and then it goes on to develop arguments of its own. It studies the world as it reads a book and finds God at the end of several paths or well-known arguments for the existence and personality of God. The *causal* argument finds that the world is an object of change or a manufactured product that calls for a Maker as certainly as a web of cloth or a watch. The *teleological* argument finds the world is intelligible in every atom and electron and is throughout a tissue of intellectual relations and ideas. It is the ideas that give birth and significance to the words on a page, they are quite meaningless except as the manifestation of a mind; so all the parts and phenomena of nature are but letters and words which fall into order and assume meaning only as they are read as the manifestation of an infinite Mind. The *anthropological* argument applies this principle to man and finds that he also is a product and cannot rise higher than his Maker and therefore the supreme Cause must be a Mind and Person.

These and other arguments which have been written out in countless volumes are ever being enlarged and illuminated by all our increasing knowledge and they lead us up the great stairways of the world to the throne of an absolute Cause or personal God. Unless it takes more reasoning power to understand the world than to create it, to construe it than to construct it, the universe must ever present its majestic front to us as the sublime appeal of Thought to thought, of an infinite Mind to our finite minds. Religion is thus not only deeply rooted in the feelings of the heart but is also logically intertwined with all the fibers of the brain.

(5) *In the Will.* The will also joins with other fundamental faculties in calling for God. We are made for action, and all our faculties of instinct and feeling and thought are so many forces pushing and guiding us into conduct and achievement. But achievement must be worthy of the powers called into action to produce it, or the mountain will labor to bring forth a mouse and human life end in pitiful results and tragic failure. Men instinctively hunt for great things to do, and along with Caleb of old they say, "Give me this mountain." They want something worth while to inspire their ambition and arouse their energies and crown their visions with victories that will satisfy their souls. They see larger and ever larger ends reaching farther and still farther into the future; and this principle finds no final end and worthy satisfaction until it runs up into the life of God and loses itself in eternal service and victory. The religious nature of man expresses itself, not only in instinct and feeling and thought, but preëminently in obedience and issues in appropriate and satisfying conduct and character.

All human life thus points beyond itself for its completion and final satisfaction. The human soul swarms with instincts, feelings, mystic emotions, thoughts, visions, and aspirations which look beyond the present world and cry out for the Infinite and Eternal. Life that stops at the horizon of this world and edge of the grave is a poor and pitiful fragment, a hopeless failure and a cruel disappointment. All our faculties feel after and fasten their filaments on God and wrap around Him and cling to Him so close and tight that they refuse to be torn loose. The whole human soul and

world is one great cry for God that has filled all the ages, and it never will be stilled and satisfied until His fulness

> Flows around our incompleteness,
> Round our restlessness his rest.[1]

3. Authority in Religion

Authority, the word implying authorship or origination, is the right of control. In the political world it is control over the external civic life and rests ultimately on the physical control of the body. In the psychological and ethical field it is the right to command our intellectual assent and moral obedience. It is this authority of inner control that falls within the field of religion. Where does this authority reside, or wherein does it consist?

(1) *The Primary Authority of Truth and Right.* The primary authority over the mind and conscience resides in truth and right. It is an intuition or axiom that we ought to believe what we see to be true and do what we believe to be right. To refuse to accept what we perceive to be true would be to contradict and subvert our mental constitution; it would implant the spirit of disloyalty and falsity in the very center of our personality. It is equally self-evident that we ought to do what we believe to be right, for to refuse to do this self-evident thing is to do what we believe to be wrong, and such an act would be a deliberate violation of conscience and must itself be wrong. We are always bound to obey conscience, even though conscience itself should be objectively wrong. Truth and right are thus the primary authority over us and we should ever give our allegiance to them in belief and conduct.

Both the mind and conscience, however, need enlightenment. The mind must have facts and principles in order to perceive what is true, and this calls for all the means of finding truth in every field. The conscience, also, must have light in order that it may see the right. We should also obey conscience, but when its light is darkness, how great is that darkness, a blind guide leading the

---

[1] Some paragraphs in this section have been taken and condensed from the author's *Psychology of Religion*, Chapter III, where a fuller treatment of these points may be found.

blind into the ditch. The cruelest or foulest deed may then commend itself to and command the conscience as an act of the purest holiness and highest obligation. Only more light can scatter the mist of ignorance and error that obscures its vision or heal its constitutional perversity and blindness. We are bound to believe the truth, but we are also bound to discover the truth. We are bound to obey conscience, but we are also bound to enlighten it.

This imposes on us the duty of using all available means for discovering truth and right. In the field of the physical sciences we must investigate nature with all the processes and instruments at our command. In history we must make unsparing use of spade and monument and document. In psychology and ethics and politics we must dissect the soul and society and discover their nature and laws. Theology uses all these means, or at least the results of all these means, in so far as it is a universal science. But there are some means that specially belong to it. It is feeling after God if haply it may find Him and must follow every ray of light that promises to lead up to Him. For it nature is an older bible that rolled out of His hand and throws some light on His presence and wisdom and power and purpose. This light becomes clearer still in the Bible, which is the express revelation of God's plan and purpose in redemption; and it reaches its perfection and undimmed splendor in Christ, in whom as accepted by Christian faith dwells the fulness and glory of God. And all these revelations lead up to God himself, Who is the first Source and final Pattern of all truth and right.

We thus have successive means or steps of authority in religion, rising through nature, man, Scripture and Christ, and culminating in God. The highest standard of truth is expressed in the affirmation, "God is light," in Whose "light shall we see light," and the highest standard of right and duty is expressed in the declaration, "We ought to obey God." God alone is the supreme Authority and Lord over the human mind and heart.

(2) *The Place of Reason in Authority.* The question of authority in the field of truth and of religion, however, is not so simple as it at first seems, and we have not yet reached its full statement but rather have only entered on this quest. After we have granted that truth and right are the primary authority and

that these find their enlightenment and expression in nature, man, Scripture, Christ and God, yet the question remains, How are we to know what these successive expressions of truth and right disclose to us and impose upon us? Still the problem arises and presses upon us, What is truth and what is right?

The answer is inevitable and inescapable: We are driven back to the use of our rational faculties or to the exercise and judgment of our own mind to discover what is true and binding upon us. All these means of enlightenment and authority from nature up through man and Scripture to Christ and God can get at us and into us only through our own apprehension and understanding, or through our own intellectual processes. We must ourselves see and interpret the facts that are presented to us in nature, man, Scripture, Christ and God, and thereby we must pass upon their truth and authority. No one of these means of truth can impose itself upon us by its sheer authority independently of our own judgment, for we cannot know that it has any truth in it and authority over us until we examine it and pass upon its claims and credentials. The mere fact that a book or prophet claims to be inspired truth and authority can have no weight with us until we test the claim, and then the claim depends for its authority upon our own decision. Many books, such as the Koran and the Book of Mormon, claim to be inspired, but we will not and ought not to acknowledge the claim until we have sat in judgment upon it. This principle necessarily applies to the Bible and to God himself.

Thus all authority external to ourselves must be apprehended and judged by our intellectual processes before it can become authority for us. Reason is the supreme judge in the court of the mind. Only its decisions can determine for us what is truth and right and thereby determine what has authority to command our belief and obedience. The only way to deny this doctrine is to use reason in denying it, and such an appeal to reason would acknowledge its supremacy and thus again install it in the primary place.[2] "Who follows truth," says W. R. Alger, "carries his star

[2] The Roman Catholic John Henry Newman saw this, for in his *Grammar of Assent* he says that Nature furnishes us for acquiring our knowledge of God "three main channels," . . . "viz., our own minds, the voice of mankind, and the course of the world," and adds: "and the most authoritative

in his brain. Even so bold a thought is no inappropriate motto for an intellectual workman, if his heart be filled with loyalty to God, the Author of truth and Maker of stars."

(3) *The Place of Feeling in Authority.* We cannot dissect the intellectual faculty from the other powers of the soul and set it to working by itself. The soul is a complex unity and all its faculties of thought, sensibility and will are interrelated and act simultaneously, though one may be predominant at any one moment and seem to submerge the others. The feelings prompt and give interest and richness to our ideas, and they pour streams of motive power upon the will. Feeling is the oldest and deepest element in the soul, and it is the great subconscious abyss out of which emerge the most powerful springs of action. Our instinctive impulses by which we primarily live, such as hunger and sociality, are not the products of reasoning but are rooted in our feelings and heredity and express our fundamental needs before we are able to reason about them and consciously supply them. "There are truths that are felt," said Pascal, "and there are truths that are proved, for we know truth not only by reason, but by the intuitive conviction which may be called the heart. The primary truths are not demonstrable, and yet our knowledge of them is not less certain. Principles are felt, propositions are proved. Truths may be above reason, and yet not contrary to reason."

Feeling is the deepest root of religion and will hold the heart fast to faith when reason grows skeptical and tries to cut this anchor chain. It is the seat of mysticism that endeavors to pass beyond the region of thought into the direct apprehension of and communion with God. This deep mystic emotion thus asserts its influence over us with a degree of authority that often overrides reason and may become imperious compulsion.

> If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
> I heard a voice "believe no more"
> And heard an ever-breaking shore
> That tumbled in the Godless deep;

---

of these three means of knowledge, as being specially our own, is our own mind." See Hurst's *History of Christian Literature*, p. 523. Dr. Francis L. Patton maintains the same supremacy of reason in his *Fundamental Christianity*, pp. 96, 110, 111, 114.

A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stood up and answer'd "I have felt."

—TENNYSON.

We must admit and welcome this place of feeling in religious authority. But it must not be carried to the extreme of excluding the reason and setting itself up as an independent authority. It is only one strand of the soul's strength and is too weak to sustain the weight of life when separated from other strands; or it is only one beam of the soul's light and may flicker out and become a blind guide when followed by itself. Feeling easily leads to fanaticism and it needs the illumination and guidance of the reason; even our most primal instincts need to be rationalized and controlled. God hath set eternity in our heart, and so out of the heart come our deepest needs and cries for Him, yet the heart should never say to the brain, "I have no need of thee," but both should work together.

(4) *The Place of Will in Authority.* In the effort to locate the seat of authority over faith and conduct, the searchlight of theory has swung around the full circle of the soul and rested in turn on each of the three fundamental faculties: now on the intellect in rationalism, then on the feelings in mysticism, and more recently on the will in pragmatism. This doctrine finds the nature as well as the test of truth in the workability of an idea. That idea or concept which works out in experience is true, and by a further step it is said that that which works is also good. We are, therefore, to plunge into the thick of life and find that which works and accept that as truth and right and give small weight to the mere logical webs spun out of the mind. The doctrine aims to reduce the reason to a minimum and increase will to a maximum. As a reaction and protest against excessive abstract intellectualism it has done good, but it has gone to an extreme. The pragmatic doctrine of workability is simply the old familiar fact that experience is the test of truth; but it is the *test* and not the *nature* of truth. Pragmatism must use the intellect in establishing and applying its principle and in so far as it discredits the intellect it

undermines itself, and in its extreme form of disowning reason it commits intellectual suicide.

But the fact remains that the will plays a vital part in establishing truth and is a weighty factor in determining our belief and behavior. Obedience is an organ of knowledge in every field. We do not know a thing well until we do it. Abstract theory must be wrought out in concrete practice. Faith must become fact. No amount of knowledge of the theory of music will make one a musician; the student must practice until his knowledge becomes his unconscious habit and spontaneity, and the instrument an automatic extension of his nervous system. Such obedience clarifies, deepens and intensifies theoretical knowledge and gives it final authority on which we rest and act with unwavering confidence. But all this is very old, whatever new emphasis and illumination pragmatists have given it. It runs all through the Bible and received clear and full expression in the words of Jesus, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak of myself."

(5) *Value Judgments.* In recent discussions in the field of religion much attention has been given to value judgments as a form of authority. The doctrine roots back in the distinction Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) drew between the pure or theoretical reason and the practical reason. By the theoretical reason he found he could not reach reality and God, but his practical reason demanded, as the necessary postulates or conditions of life, moral freedom, immortality and God. He thus accepted with his practical reason what his theoretical reason had rejected or at least failed to find. Hermann Lotze (1817-1881) found reality to consist in "soul-like things" and Ultimate Reality to be God or the Good. He reached the goodness of God through his feelings, which gave him a sense of the value of God, and he thus originated the doctrine of value judgments in its modern form. Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) elaborated this doctrine as the underlying principle of his whole system of theology. The facts of Christianity, he maintains, have their entire significance in their value for us in the Christian life. In particular and as the chief cornerstone of his system Christ has for us the value of God.

The doctrine obviously has a basis of truth. It is a psychologi-

cal fact that our sense of value resides in our feelings. The intellect perceives reality only in its factual existence and relations, but it does not take account of worths, for all facts are for it equally parts of reality. The heart, however, feels the worth of things, and it is this feeling that gives significance and interest to life and constitutes its struggles and goals, its triumphs and tragedies. We can thus look at an object in a double relation or from two points of view: what it is as a fact, and what it is worth to us. The same fact, as a piece of money, a book, or a little lock of faded hair, may have the same factual reality, viewed apart from its mental and emotional content and associations, but yet be of widely different worths to different persons, being of colorless interest to one and in another waking thoughts and feelings that are too deep for tears. Our sense of the value of religious facts will thus enter deeply into our judgment of them, and the value judgment may be the chief element in our relation to them. The practical value of the Christian facts has always been a strong argument in establishing and vindicating them.

The method is true, however, only when the value judgment is based on the factual reality as well as on the emotional worth of its object. It begins to lose touch with truth when it minimizes the objective reality and maximizes the subjective value until the object fades away and leaves only the subjective feeling. It is then an attempt to keep the shadow while giving up the substance, to retain the light after putting out the lamp, to have the fruit without the root.

This danger has been passed, if not by Ritschl himself, then by some of his followers. The purpose of the theory is to divorce the value judgments from the theoretical or intellectual judgments of the facts of Christianity so that the one may be retained whatever becomes of the other, or to make practical Christian faith and life independent of science and philosophy and higher criticism in connection with the supernatural in Christianity and thus avoid any conflict and controversy between science and religion. Ritschl himself, while using historical orthodox language in relation to Christ and his miracles and resurrection, is yet shifting and vague in his attitude towards the intellectual knowledge of the basic historic facts of Christianity. Some of his disciples, however, are

outspoken in declaring that the historicity of Christ's life and miracles is a matter of no consequence, the main fact being that Christ has the value of God for us, independently of the question of his deity or even of his historical existence.

It is evident that in this radical form the value judgment becomes a flickering light and an untrustworthy guide. No such divorce and independence can be instituted between our intellectual and our value judgments: they are indissolubly wedded together and cannot be put asunder. They are mutually dependent and modify each other, but the intellectual fact is basic to the emotional value and in the long run will assert itself and have its way. We cannot permanently keep with our hearts what we reject with our heads. The doctrine of the value judgment is true only as it keeps its judgment rooted in objective reality as well as its sense of value rooted in the subjective feelings. When the objective reality is minimized to the vanishing point, the subjective feeling will not long endure but will soon fade away with it; the shadow will vanish with the substance, the light with the lamp, and the fruit will wither when the root is cut off. When Christ ceases to be a historic reality in his divinity and supernatural works, he will soon cease to have the value of God, or any special value, for us. Jupiter and Mars were sincerely worshiped as long as they were believed to be realities, but when it was discovered they were only myths they soon disappeared and left their empty temples to be converted into Christian churches. If Christ at length is discovered to be a myth or only a man, then he in turn will also cease to be an object of worship and will take his place along with Jupiter and Mars, or, if historic existence be accorded him, then he will go into the same category with Apollonius of Tyana and Confucius. The value judgment in its right form is a true means of discovering truth and duty, but it needs to be safeguarded from a subjectivism that is fatal to objective reality and in time fatal to itself.

(6) *The Christian Consciousness.* The Christian consciousness is a form of authority in religion. The phrase designates the historic corporate consciousness and spirit of Christian believers. It does not mean the limited consciousness of any individual which is subject to his personal experience and peculiarities. It is a

social product, corresponding to what public opinion and social custom are in secular life. It is not a hastily formed judgment, but a growth that has proceeded through all the Christian centuries and embodies the accumulated and distilled experience of the generality of Christian believers. It has not been formed independently of Christ and the Scriptures, but is the deposit of the progressive interpretation and application of both Christ and Scripture as illuminated and applied by study and experience. The Christian consciousness is Christ reduplicated and extended in the body of his followers. It is the fulfilment of his own promises that he had yet many things to say unto them, that he would be with them always, even unto the end of the world, and that his Spirit would take of his things and declare these unto them and would lead them into all truth. It does not stand apart from, much less at variance with, the Bible and Christ, but is a transcript of both and keeps close to them in ever more intimate and vital understanding and fuller and more fruitful life.

As a historic fact, the religious consciousness is older than the Bible and produced it. The Old Testament grew out of the spiritual experience of the Hebrews as they were enlightened of the Holy Spirit, and their religious consciousness first secreted and then selected the books that formed the Old Testament canon and thereby determined what was and what was not Scripture. The New Testament originated in a similar way. The Christian consciousness grew up in the disciples of Christ and the first Christian believers before there was any New Testament at all. On the one hand, the Christian Scriptures grew out of the Christian consciousness as this consciousness recorded itself in and selected the books that form the New Testament canon; and then, on the other hand, the Christian consciousness has grown and still grows out of and feeds upon the New Testament. Christian consciousness is thus an unofficial interpretation or the distilled essence of the Christian Scriptures, and both together are a corporate human incarnation of the Spirit of Christ.

Of course, there is no little difficulty at times in determining what the Christian consciousness is; it is so large and widely diffused that it may not clearly speak on particular points on which it has not yet been fully formulated. Being a growth, it

exists in different stages and degrees. Of course, also, as we have already seen, no individual or small group can presume to set its own experience up as the Christian consciousness. It is only this consciousness as it has come to a consensus and found general acceptance that has authority; and its authority is always to be compared with and tested by the teaching of Scripture and the Spirit of Christ.

That the Christian consciousness has authority in shaping Christian doctrine and life is an obvious historical fact. The Christian consciousness of the New Testament relegated to desuetude some of the doctrines and ordinances of the Old Testament and swept some of its relics of barbarism, such as slavery and polygamy, off the map of Christendom; and this process is still going on. It quietly but effectively annulled Paul's prohibition of the speaking of women in church. It is the Christian consciousness and not any express teaching of Scripture or of Christ that has adopted and is enforcing the doctrine of total abstinence and the prohibition of the liquor traffic; and it is now marching forward with an ever-enlarging program of social reform and reconstruction, progressively Christianizing the whole social order. Back of all our noisy and confused politics there is an invisible power that is silently writing our laws and shaping our constitutions, to which the most partisan politician and blatant demagogue must at last bow.

The Christian consciousness from time to time rewrites our creeds, cutting out some things, such as limited atonement and the reprobation of infants dying in infancy, and putting other things, such as the duty of missions and the breadth of the love of God for the whole world, into them. In time a secular change comes over our theology and preaching, which, however unperceived it may be within a short time, becomes noticeable when the creeds and sermons of to-day are compared with those of a hundred or five hundred years ago, and the Christian consciousness brings about these changes as the secular forces of geology lift the continents and carve the mountains. Its growth may be slow and imperceptible and it may be decried and resisted, but when it has accumulated sufficient momentum and pressure it overrides all opposition and imposes its decrees, or it diffuses itself through the

240345

whole Christian atmosphere of the world and causes its seeds to bloom and its fruits to ripen gently and irresistibly as the summer sun opens buds and ripens rosy fruit and golden grain.

It should be reiterated and emphasized that all these factors and processes in authority are subject to growth and degree. While some of them, such as the Christian consciousness, are eminently the result of historical development and accumulated experience, yet all of them in varying degrees are affected by the same process. Our primary intuitions of truth and right are fixed elements in the constitution of the soul, but the means of their enlightenment is our growing knowledge as it unfolds through the ages; and the other elements in authority, reason, feeling, will, value judgments and Christian consciousness, are also subject to development. Authority in the field of religion thus changes from time to time, and what in one age is supreme in authority in another age may fall into subordinate rank or altogether lose its force.

Our analysis of authority in religion shows that there is no one voice that speaks to us in final tones or one seat in which it resides. We would fain find some single, fixed, external authority that would settle every question for us and tell us just what to believe and do. Roman Catholics think they have such an authority in the Pope, and some Protestants say they have it in the Bible. But such an authority is not psychologically possible. Did we have it we would still have to decide what it says and means and this would throw us back into all our present processes and perplexities. Though God Himself spoke to us out of the heavens or wrote His message in letters of light across the sky we would have to interpret the voice or the inscription and would be involved in the whole difficulty of determining its meaning; and after we had determined this, our decision and thereby its authority would rest upon our judgment and thus would be based upon the primary authority of our own minds. Yet this does not leave us in hopeless uncertainty and perplexity, for we are so constituted that we can find truth and right, and God has not left us without light. We can use our own faculties and we are bound to accept and act upon our own sense of truth and duty; and we are also bound to use all the means for enlightening our

minds and conscience as found in nature, man, Scripture, Christ and God.

This is the method and spirit of the Bible and of Christ himself. The Bible never imposes its word upon us by mere authority. It constantly challenges us to try the spirits and to search all things and hold fast only that which is good. God Himself does not attempt to override our faculties, but bids us, "Come now, and let us reason together." He has endowed us with reason and wants us to use it to its full power and responsibility. Having entrusted us with reason he would not stifle our minds and stultify his own work by refusing to allow our reason to fulfil its proper function. This is true rationalism. There is a kind of "rationalism" that is in great disrepute in theological circles: that use and spirit of the reason by which it exalts itself into a source of knowledge and authority independent of and superior to all other means of truth and duty, especially of revelation. But this is a false rationalism which is foreign to the true use and spirit of the reason.

The most beautiful instance of the true attitude of religion to reason found in the Bible and in all religious literature is the reply of Jesus to John the Baptist when he sent to Jesus asking him if he were the Messiah. John in his prison cell and mood had fallen into doubt on this fundamental point; yet Jesus did not blame him for his doubt and tell him to stop thinking and hush up his doubts; nor did he return him a dogmatic answer, settling the question for him by sheer authority; but he sent additional facts, more light, to John and told him to think the problem through for himself. In effect, Jesus threw John back upon the reasoning power and primary authority of his own mind. This is simply the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment. God has given us plenty of facts, abundance of light, in this tangled and dark world, for us to find the way of truth and duty, but we must work out the problem of truth and duty for ourselves. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind." There is no other way. And as we walk in this way, often in difficulty and perplexity, we shall find that it follows him who said, "I am the truth," and that it issues in the presence of God, Who is light, the supreme source and authority of all truth and right.

In following this path we shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.

4. Theology a Progressive Science

(1) *All Science Is Progressive.* The universe is for the human mind an inexhaustible field in which it never impinges upon a boundary or frontier and God himself is the unexplored infinitude of all knowledge. Every problem solved by the human mind brings to view a hundred others it has not solved and perhaps never can solve, and thus its conscious ignorance grows faster than its knowledge. However vast the circle of its light, vaster still is the circle of darkness that shuts it in.

Also, the mind itself has unbounded capacity and thirst for knowledge. It is never satisfied with what it knows, but ever reaches out with wider grasp and keener eagerness for what it does not know, and thus it has an insatiable appetite that would masticate and digest the universe. As the results of the activities of such a mind in such a field, science has been and is advancing with rapid steps and leaps and flights that are the amazement of our modern world. Human knowledge is thus ever broadening and rushing forward as a mighty river and its majestic sweep is an impressive spectacle and its beneficent currents are irrigating all the fields of life.

(2) *Theology Shares in This Progress.* Theology shares in this progress by which its thoughts are widening with the process of the suns. It would be its obvious condemnation and disgrace if this were not so. If it alone should stand still and stagnant amidst this immense and universal progress, the only eddy in this mighty stream, this fact would be fatal to religious faith and to the theologian's self-respect. It would strip theology of all right to be considered a science and relegate it, along with astrology and alchemy, to obsolete pseudo-sciences, or, along with animism and fetishism, to the outworn superstitions of the world.

But theology quickly frees itself from all such associations and suspicions and abundantly proves its progressiveness. It has the same grounds for progress as any other science, for its field is the universe and God, and no possible fact or thought is foreign to it.

It sends out a decree that all the world shall be taxed in its interest. All other sciences bring grist to its mill. The human mind has as great capacity and appetite for religious knowledge as for any other kind, and, in fact, no other human interest is so profound and intense.

Not only does theology have a boundless field for progress in the world, but it has the same ground in the Scriptures themselves. There is progress within the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and it contains the seeds of endless progress beyond its time. It is largely a germinal book in which religious ideas are only planted and begin to sprout, and their full growth and fruitage is a process that stretches through all future ages. Jesus himself was clear-sighted and far-reaching in his predictions and promises of such progress, as we shall later see. Many of his parables pictured it, and he expressly said that he had yet many things to say unto his disciples but that they could not bear them then and promised that the Spirit would come and lead them into all truth. If theology has learned nothing and been stagnant through all these centuries, these promises have failed and proved futile hopes.

But the fact of progress in Christian theology is as patent as is that of any other science. It has moved down through the ages broadening and deepening its stream as it has gathered into its current all the tributaries of human knowledge. It has also been exploring its Scriptures and drawing from them fuller and clearer understanding and experience of the mind of God and of Christ and working out its doctrines into broader and richer duties and applications. As a result theology to-day shows an immense advance over that of Augustine or Anselm or Calvin. A hundred or even fifty years is enough to put any treatise on the subject out of date. One need only compare a current work on theology with one of the last generation to be aware of a change in the theological climate. There are differences in views and in points of view, in emphasis and tone. Could the most orthodox follower of Calvin to-day have been caught in Geneva when Calvin was ruling there, he would have gone to the stake.

Every great discovery of truth in any field will have its effect upon and may rearrange the whole field of theology. Every age

is a transitional age. This progress is advancing more rapidly than ever in our day, and we are constantly leaving some things behind and pressing towards the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

(3) *The Old and the New in Theology.* This progress in theology has necessarily been attended with some friction and alarm and often it has been feared that the new was the enemy and destroyer of the old. But old and new are not necessarily antagonistic and mutually exclusive, but may be complementary and harmonious. It is the old sun that shines upon us, but its light is new every morning. The clouds are very old, but their silver nets and golden fringes are ever resplendently new. The old bushes remain, but their roses are fresh every June. We still wear clothes as our fathers did, but we cut them after our own fashions; we eat food, but the dishes differ. And so our faith must ever grow out of the past and in its roots be old, but it must also embody and express itself in terms of the present and flower out into new blossoms and fruit. We believe in the old faith in its fundamental facts and principles, but its form and expression should exude out of and express our own thought and life. Jesus urged us to bring out of our treasure things old and new, and this duty is ever upon us.

Theology is not a dead and desiccated science, an ancient mummy in its coffin, but it is still full of new blood and fresh life and ever develops into larger growth and fuller vitality and finer fruit. Its divine principles are eternal, but its human expression should ever be adapted to the present time and needs, and its voice should be a living voice and speak in the language of to-day. We should not cling to the old simply because it is old, or reject or fear or suspect the new simply because it is new; neither should we disparage the old or rush to the new as such; but we should welcome and hold to both only because and in so far as they are true. Our Christian faith will thus not be in constant antagonism with our growing knowledge, irritating and alienating educated and cultured believers in or sympathizers with the Christian religion, and it will not grow obsolete and be left behind, but will ever keep abreast of the age and appeal to and hold the most sincere and thoughtful minds. We shall then ever have religious knowledge

that is both conservative and progressive, taxing all the world in its interest and keeping pace with all our progress, so that it will constantly express living realities, fitting the facts of life and appealing vitally and vividly to and satisfying our religious needs.

This progressive spirit of theology by which the old faith ever absorbs and assimilates new knowledge and keeps abreast of our growing life is the principle and process of modernism.

CHAPTER III

SCIENCE

We next take up the general nature and relations of science as laying further groundwork for our main problem.

1. Definition and Method of Science

Science is a systematic body of knowledge on any subject. It aims to gather all the facts in its field, arrange and classify them into order, deduce their causal connections and laws, and trace them back to their origin and forecast their future. Such knowledge is the inevitable outgrowth of the constitution of the mind and is the necessary means of the increasing mastery of nature and of all the conditions of life.

The steps in scientific investigation are described by J. Arthur Thompson as follows: "The first step in scientific procedure is to collect data, and all science begins with measurement. The second step is the arrangement and classification of facts. Auxiliary to this and to formulation is the process of analysis or reduction to simpler terms. In order to fulfil the aim of describing facts of experience as exactly as possible, it is often necessary to try one hypothesis after another. An important step in procedure is the carrying out of test experiments. The final result is a general formula or law of Nature, or, more frequently, the inclusion of a new set of facts within the old law. At every step imagination counts and its highest flights are called genius."[1]

Experimentation by the method of trial and error is a potent means of progress in science. Professor H. S. Jennings, of Johns Hopkins University, in his address at the dedication of the Whit-

[1] *Introduction to Science,* pp. 79-80.

man Laboratory of Experimental Zoology at the University of Chicago on June 4, 1926, said: "To learn how to experiment, the only method *is* to experiment; to make errors, and then later to avoid errors. The errors are an essential part of the process; no errors, no advance. But after they are made they must not be repeated, no elimination of errors, no advance. And to eliminate them we must mark them."[2] Science thus makes mistakes and expects to make them. It is not afraid of trial and adventure and follows uncertain trails and dangerous paths. It runs risks. But it frankly faces its errors and seeks to correct them. It feeds on its own failures and derives strength from its own weakness. It mounts on its own mistakes to higher truth and broader vision. It does not try to conceal them and is not ashamed of them. It acknowledges them openly. It knows that it is better to make mistakes than to make no advance, which is the greatest mistake of all. It rejoices in errors as the price it must pay for progress. It knows that honest confession is good for its soul and that such love of truth is its glory. All new truth grows out of the soil of old errors, and not only science but the whole world of progress is carried forward on the wings of mistaken theories and dreams.

The aim of science is described in Minto's *Logic, Inductive and Deductive,* as follows: "The Mandate issued to the age of Plato and Aristotle was, *Bring your beliefs into harmony one with another.* The Aristotelian logic was framed in response to this order: its main aim was to devise instruments for making clear the coherence, the concatenation, the mutual implication of current beliefs. The mandate of the Medieval Spirit was, *Bring your beliefs into harmony with dogma.* The medieval logic was contracted from Aristotle's under this impulse. Then, as science developed, a new spirit was roused the mandate of which was, *Bring your beliefs into harmony with facts.* It was under this impulse that the body of methodical doctrine vaguely called Induction gradually originated." The second of these mandates has largely lost standing, but the other two remain and the last one now stands dominant.

---

[2] Published in *Science,* July 30, 1926.

The ancient Greeks with their wonderful minds built their science on the method of deduction from general principles that were largely assumed. On the basis of a superficial observation of nature and the collection of a few facts, hardly any of which were accurately observed and critically tested, they proceeded to draw from their general principles theoretical conclusions as to the whole field and structure of nature that soon widely diverged from the facts.

The foundations of modern science began in the thirteenth century with Roger Bacon who, while looking to the deductive principle of mathematics as the main method of science, yet saw, however dimly and confusedly, that observation and experiment must lie at the base of the study of nature and thus caught a glimpse of the principle of induction. The full glory of the discovery of this principle, however, belongs to Francis Bacon, of the sixteenth century, who in his *Novum Organum* laid the foundations of modern science. He severed science from metaphysical considerations, ceased to spin it from subjective axioms by deductive processes and built it directly on the ground of nature by an induction from its facts.

Bacon's principle, of which he made little use and application himself so that his name is not connected with any concrete scientific discovery, in the hands of his successors became a torchlight for exploring the jungle of nature. Galileo applied it to physics and astronomy, and Newton brought the whole universe within its grasp. Leibnitz and Laplace followed in the same track and all later natural scientists have continued to apply this powerful principle of investigation and discovery down to our day.

It is true that induction taken by itself apart from theory may be as impotent and fruitless as is deduction when used in a vacuum as an abstract principle apart from facts. Deduction furnishes the principles that illuminate and interpret the facts supplied by induction and often casts its light ahead to guide induction. Both of these scientific principles and processes must be used together and are like the two wings of a bird or an airplane, with only one of which neither bird nor plane can fly. Deduction is the application of the scientific imagination which discerns theoretical prin-

ciples which, when applied to the facts gathered by induction, fertilize them and cause them to sprout and bloom into a glorious world. Deduction is also a prophet and pioneer that runs ahead and predicts logical conclusions that must then wait on induction to confirm or modify them.

The proper combination of both induction and deduction, studying nature at first hand and yet illuminating it with general principles, has created our amazing world of modern science. Under the impulse and guidance of these methods natural science has gone forward by leaps and bounds. Within the last hundred years a hundred new sciences have been born and grown into giant power, and all the old sciences have been reconstructed and rewritten. Field after field of nature has been invaded and explored. Astronomy has enormously pushed out the frontiers of the universe and disclosed astounding wonders of solar monsters and systems, of size and speed and space, of majesty and mystery of which the older astronomers never dreamed. From the infinitely great, science has also swung to the opposite extreme of the infinitesimally small and disclosed new worlds of wonder equally astonishing. The atom, the ultimate indivisible particle of matter of former physics, has been blown to pieces, revealing an unsuspected interior world as complex and mysterious as a constellation. The reign of physical law has been extended over ever-widening areas until the outermost star and the last electron have been brought under its control. The present scientific picture of the physical world is that of an enormous mechanism in which no atom ever slips out of its place or star ever shoots a forbidden ray and in which wheel within wheel, from electron to zodiac, moves in exquisite harmony.

Theology is subject to all of these scientific canons. On any subject in its field it endeavors to reach and assemble all the facts and then to classify and collocate them; it draws inferences on the grounds of analogy, induction, and deduction; it forms hypotheses and tests and modifies them so as to bring them into closer approximation to experience; it uses the imagination as a pioneer and creator in the discovery and construction of truth; and it endeavors to bring its conclusions and doctrines into harmony with one another and, above all, into harmony with reality.

2. Kinds and Relations Among the Sciences

(1) *Kinds of Science.* Sciences are of two general kinds: descriptive and normative. *Descriptive science* deals with fields of fact that contain no element of moral obligation and such science simply describes things as they are. *Normative science* sets up ideals and imposes obligations. Descriptive science also deals with measurements, and normative with values, the one with quantities, and the other with qualities.[3] Mathematics and astronomy and geology are descriptive and only ask to be understood, but ethics and theology are normative and speak to us in commanding tones of duty and obedience. The one kind of science takes things as they are, but the other tries to make them what they ought to be. Sciences are also pure or practical, or they branch into science and art. Pure science is theoretical knowledge, and its corresponding art is skill in its application in life. Music as a science is knowledge of its technical laws, and as an art it is skill in vocal or instrumental expression. Theology as science is the doctrine of which the art is religion or religious life.

(2) *Relations Among the Sciences.* The boundaries between the sciences are largely theoretical and are like the imaginary geographical and political lines that divide the continuous surface of the map or globe. Every science at its margin fades out and melts into neighboring sciences. Astronomy runs into geology, geology into physics, and physics into chemistry. Chemistry borders on biology, biology invades psychology, and psychology merges into logic and ethics. All sciences contribute to one another in mutual service, and no great science can haughtily say to the humblest member of the family, "I have no need of thee." All knowledge is interrelated and at last forms one organic unity.

Each science accepts and uses the established results of other sciences; the finished products of one are the raw materials of another. It is only by this division of labor that scientific men can investigate each his own special field, depending upon others for such materials and tools as belong to their fields. Theology is one among the general circle of sciences and shares in and uses their

[3] This distinction is wrought out in B. H. Streeter's *Reality.*

results. It occupies a central position and borders upon all fields. As a universal science, along with philosophy, it taxes all fields and they all bring grist to its mill.

(3) *Authority Among the Sciences.* The question of authority among the sciences is one of importance and is often attended with difficulty. The right of each science to speak with authority within its own field must be granted and respected. The specialist who has given exhaustive study to a subject must have knowledge of it that other men cannot dispute, unless they make a thorough investigation of the same subject and speak with the same authority. The astronomer cannot disown any of his discoveries at the bidding of the chemist, and the chemist must be allowed to exercise his authority in his field over the biologist. The psychologist has the right of way over the sociologist, and the sociologist over the metaphysician. The theologian comes under this law and must accept the established results of all other sciences both descriptive and normative. It is vain for him to set himself up against the geologist or biologist on questions relating to the origin and age of the earth and the evolution of life, unless he himself becomes a competent expert on these subjects and can speak with first-hand knowledge and authority. The theologian cannot bring his concept of God to the field of science to dictate and shape its results, for the facts of science must enter into and help to form and fill out his concept of God.

It is true that the specialist in any field cannot impose his results on other students by his sheer authority and require of them a blind acceptance. Every investigator must hold his results open and subject to review and further investigation by other students, and no one can deny or escape this test and judgment. Yet it remains true that the specialist in any field will rightly have a weight of authority that men untrained in that field cannot have.

3. The Scientific Spirit

Deeper than scientific method is the scientific spirit.

(1) The fundamental mark of the scientific spirit is *love of truth.* Its first thought and aim is, What are the facts? Not, What do we think or wish the facts to be, or what have others thought them

to be, but what are the facts themselves? The aim of the scientific spirit is to go straight to reality and find out the truth about it. It is, therefore, at bottom an honest love for the truth and a sincere and desperate attempt to get at it.

We may describe the scientific spirit more closely as being marked by unprejudiced impartiality and candor in its search for truth. It is unprejudiced in that it does not start with the conclusion of its investigation silently assumed, or with prejudgments that force the conclusion. It is free from self-interest whether of any material kind or of pride of opinion or of self-consistency. It is dispassionate in that it does not allow feeling to flood the mind so as to drown out the lamp of reason or cloud its vision and judgment. It is fair and candid in that it seeks to consider all the facts and to face all difficulties, and it gives full audience to all opposing theories. Its aim and motive is, Let us know the truth though our heavens fall.

The scientific spirit stands in contrast with the partisan and dogmatic method and temper in their disposition and effort to see all things in their own light and prove their preformed conclusions. Theology has acquired this spirit, though at times slowly and reluctantly. It now knows that it has no sources, documents and dogmas that are to be accepted on the ground of mere authority, but that it must subject all its data and doctrines to the most critical tests of truth. It has no sacred robe that hides it from the archeologist's pick and spade, the historian's most searching cross-examination, the scientist's dissecting knife, acid and flame, and the philosopher's merciless categories, but it must submit to and invite and prosecute the most thorough and pitiless investigation. The scientific temper is simply the spirit of him who said, "I am the truth." This spirit should preëminently mark and move his followers and should specially pervade all religious study and teaching. The Bible itself is permeated by the scientific spirit. Its constant call and test is, "Come, now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah"; "Come and see"; and "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

(2) *Affinity and Sympathy.* Next in importance to the love of truth in the scientific spirit is the spirit of affinity and sympathy with any subject which is the object of our study. We necessarily

see and interpret and thus know all things through the apperception of our experience and through the disposition and constitution of our own minds. We can see nothing outside us that we do not have in its nature inside us. A blind man cannot see even the blazing sun, and one deficient in artistic or musical sense cannot perceive the beauties of art or the melodies of music. When Turner showed one of his sunsets to a friend and the friend remarked that he had never seen such a sunset the painter replied, "Don't you wish you could?" When the Sultan of Persia visited Edward, Prince of Wales, and the prince took him to an orchestral concert in London, the Sultan manifested childish delight while the musicians were tuning up their instruments, but he showed signs of perplexity and pain when they began to play. It is a truism of psychology that we can know only what we have some affinity with. Sympathy with a subject is, therefore, one of the first conditions of a proper understanding of it. It would not be thought that a blind man could study light, or that one without capacity and training in mathematics could write or criticize a treatise on the differential calculus. No one wants to be judged by one who is hostile or unsympathetic, and every science and art rightly asks for proper capacity and affinity on the part of its students and critics.

Theology, therefore, demands no peculiar favor when it asks for sympathy and affinity with its subject on the part of those who study it and either support or oppose its doctrines. It is not only an intellectual study but also a living experience, and the study cannot be properly appreciated or even understood apart from the experience. Paul is simply insisting on a true psychological principle and prerequisite when he declares: "Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged" (I Cor. 2:14). If, therefore, one approaches the study of religion prejudiced by any hostile attitude and purpose, or with a disqualifying lack of sympathy and affinity with it, one cannot do it justice and will fail to understand it and may even be as the blind leading the blind. We must "taste" before we can "see that the Lord is good." It must ever be true that religious capacity and experience are a ground of faith and organ of knowledge having access to truth that will be missed and may be scoff-

ingly denied by one who has no such affinity. "The friendship of Jehovah is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his covenant" (Ps. 25:14).

(3) *Humility.* The spirit of humility is a fundamental condition of any study and an element in the scientific attitude towards truth. Huxley said that the scientific man in order to study any fact should sit down before it in the spirit of a little child. A still greater Teacher taught the same truth: "Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18:3). This teachable and receptive attitude puts the mind in right relations with a subject, whereas the spirit of conceit and pride and arrogance blurs the mind's vision or narrows and deadens its receptivity and thus causes it to miss or misunderstand the truth. Theology, handling such high and holy and mysterious themes, is in special need of a humble and teachable spirit. Any presumption or pride of opinion or partisan dogmatism or pontifical infallibility incapacitates the theologian for the calm and clear envisagement of reality that is the only means of seeing spiritual truth. In attempting to scale these dizzy heights we need to walk humbly lest we fall.

As a result of our increased sense of the vastness of truth and of our limited powers in its presence, theology has grown more cautious and knows less than formerly. It sees the great outstanding facts of God's being and nature and relations to the world, but it no longer analyzes Him with the detail and the confidence that the botanist analyzes a flower. It perceives that it sees in a mirror, often darkly, and knows that it knows only in part. This attitude of modern theology is reflected in the shortened creeds of our day and in the shrunken space occupied in theological treatises on such subjects as the Trinity, the divine decrees and eschatology.

The kingdom of God is entered through the child-spirit of teachableness and trust, and humble human hearts are ever the dear Lord's best interpreters.

4. Development of the Scientific Spirit

The scientific spirit of love of truth, of sympathy with truth and of humility is a rare attainment in the field of knowledge both

in science and in religion. Man at first is ruled by instinct and self-interest and passion and sees all things in the light of his own selfish needs and desires, and only slowly does he climb out of these lower levels and murky clouds to the heights of clear vision and dispassionate search for truth.

Science itself has passed through these stages of development. It is only in modern times that scientific men have acquired in some measure the scientific spirit of truth, sympathy and humility. They have not seldom been dogmatic and domineering in their attitude and spirit, intolerant towards other thinkers, not only in religion but even in their own fields, impatient of criticism while freely exercising it with acid sharpness and bitterness themselves. Especially have they been disposed to mix up their own philosophical and religious opinions and prejudices with their proper science and presume to extend their scientific prestige over matters and speak with pontifical authority on questions outside their own fields.

Men of science have been free to admit their faults in this respect. "The too exclusive study," says Jevons, "of particular branches of physical science seems to generate an over-confident and dogmatic spirit."[4] "The victory" (of science), says a professor of physics, "has not only reacted on science in such a way as to give the world a too implicit confidence in its hypotheses, but it has also made men of science dogmatic and rash in proposing bold and unsupported speculations—impatient of criticism themselves and hypercritical towards religion, philosophy, and all other methods of human thought."[5]

A notable book on this subject has recently appeared, entitled *Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century*, by the Rev. Robert H. Murray, with an Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. In this large and learned volume the author traces the history of science through the last century and shows how every important scientific discovery was opposed and misrepresented and ridiculed by rival scientists. Jenner with his vaccine, Simpson with his chloroform, Lyell with his uniformitarianism in geology, Darwin and evolution, Pasteur and microbes, and Lister with his antisep-

[4] *Principles of Science*, p. 737.

[5] Professor L. T. More in *The Limitations of Science*, p. 189.

tics, encountered this unfair treatment and unhappy fate. Many lesser scientists who made notable contributions to science were neglected and consigned to oblivion. The work is as humiliating reading for scientists as Andrew D. White's monumental *Warfare of Science with Theology* is for theologians. Sir Oliver Lodge in his Introduction to Murray's book admits the truth and gravity of the author's charge, but pleads that scientists have grown more broad-minded and tolerant in our day. "In the past," he says, "we see the supporters of new doctrine, the detectors of unwelcome facts, coming forward apologetically, humbly presenting their credentials, and we see them immediately snuffed out or else browbeaten and ridiculed by the High Priests of Science. Surely that sort of thing cannot happen to-day!" It is to be hoped not, and yet this "sort of thing" may still lurk in some scientific breasts. There is such a thing as heterodoxy in science that still pervades the scientific world and makes itself felt.

Theologians, however, have always been charged with a heavy burden of deficiency in the scientific spirit and of opposition and intolerance towards new truth. They have been inveterately and often incorrigibly conservative and have stood in the path of advancing knowledge. They can be counted on to oppose scientific discoveries and theories. They have set themselves against practically every historic advance in science, with resulting discomfiture to themselves. White's history of this warfare, himself a Christian communicant, is a mournful monument of the mistaken zeal of theologians in rushing across the boundaries of their field into the domain of science and defending positions they had finally to abandon and attacking scientific doctrines they at last had to accept. However, they, along with scientists, are learning their lesson and are growing out of their dogmatic temper into the true scientific spirit. Many of them are as true to this spirit and method as any scientist.

We must not, however, do theologians the injustice of supposing that they have universally as a class opposed the advance of scientific investigation and knowledge. On the contrary, many of them, such as Copernicus and Priestley, Malthus and Mendel, have themselves been scientific pioneers and made notable contributions to science, and the Christian church has ever been a mother and

nursery of learning. A competent witness on this point is Dr. G. Stanley Hall, who says: "Christianity always has brought enlightenment, and kindled the torch of culture and science, and banished spiritual darkness."[6]

There is a reason why religious faith is more conservative and jealous of its position than is science. Its roots are deeper and more fundamental and vital, especially to the highest interests of life, than are the roots of science, and they are less subject to change. Religion has a few fixed principles, such as God and faith and prayer and obedience, and spiritual values and eternal hopes, and, while these grow and unfold and branch out in their fruits and application, yet like the roots of oaks and pines they are little disturbed by superficial changes of the weather. Religious thinkers and worshipers, therefore, are watchful against any hostile views that they think would destroy or injure these roots. They instinctively feel that there are some foundations that must be permanent and can be undermined only at the peril of the whole structure of their temple. Religious faith will protect itself against every enemy and will fight for its life. Like patriotism it will lay down its life for its homes, its altars and its fires. It believes that all the higher interests of life are involved in this defense and that the very welfare of the human race is at stake. It, therefore, stands on guard for this precious and vital deposit that has been committed to it. And however mistaken it may be at particular points, it does well to stand as for its life in defense of fundamental truth. It will run no risks and is therefore slow, often obstinately and vexatiously too slow, in seeing and accepting new scientific truth. But its motive is good. It will not tear down the old house until a new and better roof has been erected.

On the other hand, scientists do not have the practical interest in their theories that the theologians have in theirs. The most precious interests of life do not immediately and vitally depend on their conclusions that are often abstract and remote from practical affairs. They can see their theories undermined and modified and even swept away without any sense of peril and loss. This makes it easier for them to be more open-minded and less sus-

[6] *Jesus, the Christ, in the Light of Psychology*, Vol. II, p. 534.

picious towards new truth than are theologians. Religious conservatism thus has a large degree of justification for its slowness in receiving new truth, for it does not want to run the risk of changing the old until the new has been thoroughly tested and established. Yet theologians may be too persistent and obstinate in their conservatism and harden it into unreasoning prejudice and plant it as a rock in the path of advancing knowledge, and for this they must be held to account before the bar of truth.

It should be said, in closing this chapter, that science should recognize and respect the inalienable rights of religion and seek to come into sympathetic understanding of it. In the sense of general knowledge and especially of philosophy, science is bound by its very nature and profession to study religion as one of the indubitable and ineradicable facts of the world and make room for it in its scheme and do it justice. While this is the special office of theology as the science of religion, yet all science has some relation to religion and is under obligation to give it due place and consideration as a part of reality. The scientist is also a man, and nothing human should be uninteresting to him.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL RELATIONS OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE

Religion and science at first were children of the same family of human service and dwelt under the same ancestral roof. They were united in the primitive priest who was also the primitive physician. Theology and medicine were branches of the same tree of knowledge and grew together. In primitive society, the patriarch was the incarnation of the concentrated wisdom and authority of his tribe, a composite person uniting in himself ruler and priest and physician, scientist and philosopher and teacher. In time, division of labor separated these offices and assigned them each to a specialist. Religion and science, thus starting together as twins, then went out from the old home and began to pursue their separate courses. They soon began to diverge in methods and aims and results, with consequential disagreements and conflicts.

The discoverers of new knowledge have, from time to time, come back to the home of the old faith and found it too narrow for them. The prophets of the ancestral religion have, in turn, looked upon the bearers of new knowledge with suspicion and hostility and even horror as ruthless destroyers of the old faith and have denied them admission to the temple of religion. The two have thus fallen out, and this age-long conflict has been attended with much discomfort and distress and worse consequences, at times culminating in persecution and bloodshed and war.

We are now moving into the thick of our problem, which is how to adjust these differences into harmony, and we are ready to take a general view of the problem.

1. Inadequate Solutions

Some methods of dealing with the problem are futile or inadequate. An easy and quick solution is to say that there is no con-

flict between religion and science, but this is to fly in the face of existing facts. If it is meant, however, that the conflict is only between imperfect religion and imperfect science, or between theologians and scientists, this is an obvious fact, but it leaves the whole problem of their adjustment unsolved on our hands and we are just where we started.

A radical solution of the situation is the view that one of these antagonists will ultimately destroy the other and take sole possession of the field. There is no thought or disposition on the part of religious thinkers to destroy science, for it is universally admitted that it is solidly rooted in reality and is a necessary exercise of the human mind and has immense practical benefits and splendid achievements to its credit. However, there are advocates of religion of the fundamentalist type who have attempted and are yet attempting to restrict and hamper science in ways that tend to strangle it to death or at least into a comatose condition. Even civil law has been enlisted in this "warfare" of religion against science. Such a movement and means, however, are as futile as attempting to sweep back the tides of the ocean with a broom; though it achieve a brief temporary success here and there, yet its end is sure. Such obscurantism cannot live in the light of our modern world. It adds, as at Dayton, Tennessee, to the gaiety of the nations, sending ripples or roars of laughter around the world, but it is folly that contributes nothing to the solution of our problem. It is a survival of medievalism and will wither under growing intelligence.

But can science destroy religion? This is an article of faith with some opponents of religion. Few are the scientific men who lend the color of their science to any such view, but there are shallow thinkers who loudly declaim in the name of science or of radicalism against religion and announce its doom and extinction as an outworn and dead superstition that is bound to disappear and leave only fossil forms in the strata of our enlightened and liberated civilization. These opponents of religion, however, are more dangerous in their bark than in their bite and need give us little concern. Yet there are more serious opponents of historic faiths, including Christianity, in the field of agnostic and deterministic philosophy, and their views will be considered later.

The indubitable fact is that religion stands as a constitutional and ineradicable element in human nature as fundamental and indestructible as thirst for knowledge and hunger for bread. It is rooted in the deepest soil of the human soul and is grounded in the constitution of the universe. All human history and experience bear witness to it and it does not wither under the light of advancing science, but grows with all our growth. It has its roots down deeper than our reason, in the instincts and mystic intuitions and yearnings of the heart, and as reason did not create it, so reason cannot destroy it.

Yet while both religion and science stand rooted in reality and neither can destroy the other, they are mutually critical of each other's methods and results and may kill off each other's errors. Science cannot destroy religion, but it may destroy noxious weeds in its field; and while religion cannot kill science, it can help to keep it in its proper sphere and correct its unwarranted conclusions. They should thus be mutually helpful and work together.

Another inadequate solution of our problem is that religion and science move in entirely different fields or at different levels of reality and so do not touch and cannot clash. There is some truth in this view as there is in all these partial but inadequate solutions. Science deals with phenomena, or the world of appearances as apprehended by the senses and extensions of our sense processes. It perceives and measures and classifies facts and endeavors to deduce their relations and laws, but it does not seek to penetrate into the deeper region of the ultimate reality that is manifested in these appearances. This deeper reality is the search of philosophy and the field of theology. They strive to pass beyond the phenomenal into the noumenal, from the proximate fact into the ultimate reality. These two processes may go on with little immediate reference to each other and thus avoid coming to grips in open conflict.

However, this solution of our problem is another inadequate one, for our total knowledge is not distributed in water-tight compartments and there is no way of keeping the fields and facts of separate sciences isolated and immune from each other. They will overlap and interfuse and modify one another. The student of science cannot help insensibly passing from his science over into

philosophy, and the philosopher boldly proclaims that all fields and facts are his and simply spin threads for his loom. So we must find some deeper adjustment than this division of labor between religion and science. They will get together and we must find a way of having them meet peaceably on common ground and achieving ultimate harmony and unity.

A related inadequate solution is the Ritschlian attempt to keep the spiritual values of religion apart from scientific facts, let the latter be what they may. Even the facts of history are thrown upon this religious scrap-heap as irrelevant to faith. We have already considered this view and found it unworkable and futile. Values are rooted in facts, and we cannot give up the facts and keep the values. When we blow out the candle or turn off the electric current, the light vanishes.

And so the solution of our problem cannot be found in any refusal or failure to face the facts of conflict, and we must find some deeper ground of unity, some central sea of serenity undisturbed by surface storms and waves.

2. The Unity of the World

The fundamental solution of our problem is to be found in the unity of the world. That the world is a unitary system is the basic fact or faith of both religion and science. This assumption is necessary to religion as the necessary field of a unitary sovereign God. It is equally the necessary assumption of science as only a cosmos can be the field of science and a chaos would render science impossible.

This fact is assumed by all physical science, though it may be as an article of faith which cannot be demonstrated. On this point we again quote Huxley: "As for the strong conviction that the cosmic order is rational, and the faith that, throughout all durations, unbroken order has reigned in the universe, I not only accept it, but am disposed to think it the most important of all truths."

The exploration of the physical universe bears out this assumption as far as it has gone. There are elements and laws that are found to be coterminous with the known universe. The chemical

elements of matter are identical in our earth and in all the stars and nebulæ. Light is the same radiant energy moving with the same speed throughout all space, and gravitation acts according to the same law out to the frontiers of the universe. To quote a single high authority on this point: "The physical universe has been found to be subject to highly exact laws. As far as the underlying theory has been revealed to man, these laws appear to be unified and grandiose."[1] The physical universe is thus found to be a mechanism in which every atom and electron and vibration of energy acts in harmony with law and all together constitute a perfect unitary system.

But the physical universe is only a part and a subordinate part of the total universe of finite reality. Not less certainly than we find material elements do we find mental and moral and spiritual elements or beings. Our own minds are centers of such experiences and these are the most certain things we know. Not only so, but we project our mental ideas of form and order and law and purpose out through the world to its utmost bounds. The universe thus becomes intelligible in the light of mind, or as a manifestation of mind. It is a tissue of intellectual relations which we read as we read a book. All the lines of religion and of purposeful philosophy run up to God as the Supreme Cause and Person of the total universe of matter and mind.

The fact of evil in the world is a disturbing factor in this view and it does break the moral harmony of the world. On this ground there have been and are such thinkers as John Stuart Mill and such religions as Zoroastrianism that have found two ultimate principles, one of good and one of evil, in the universe, and there are other forms of philosophical pluralism. This is a problem of philosophy that lies beyond our field, and it must suffice to say that from a theistic point of view there is and can be only one supreme and sovereign Ruler in the total universe. On this theory evil is regarded as a subordinate and exceptional fact, due to the free agency of responsible creatures.

The material world thus lies ensphered in a vaster spiritual world in which are personal spirits and all the values of human life;

[1] Professor George D. Birkhoff in his Lectures on *Relativity*, p. 29.

or, God is immanent in the world and the world is immanent in God, somewhat as our consciousness is immanent in our ideas or mental states, and our ideas are immanent in our consciousness.

The total universe is thus a unitary system in which all things work together under law in harmony. The fact of rebellious human wills breaks the moral order but not the unitary consistency of the whole.

Truth is the mental apprehension of reality, or a working relation with it. As the fundamental reality is one and the universal system is a coherent and harmonious whole, all perfect truth must ultimately be consistent and unitary. All the radii of the universe, physical, mental and spiritual, run to one center and every part and point is coherently related to the whole. Truth in one field must fit into truth in another field, however widely separated or diverse in form the two truths may be.

Difficulty and discord arise at this point from the fact that all our apprehensions of truth are partial and imperfect and sometimes are vitiated with radical misunderstanding and error. This throws these imperfect forms of truth out of harmony into disagreement that may become contradiction and collision. It is this imperfection of our views that sows all the fields of knowledge with error and conflict and turns them into "a dust of systems and of creeds." If we could all see reality in the same light under perfect forms of apprehension we would all see alike and be in agreement. But this is not possible with finite minds that can each see only in part, an infinitesimal part, in the midst of an infinite maze of complexity and mystery.

The conclusion at this point is that all our disagreements in the field of truth and especially our conflicts between religion and science grow out of our imperfect knowledge and varying discordant views of unitary truth, and that if we could all bring our imperfect fragmentary views into a perfect envisagement of reality they would all fall into coherence and harmony and our conflicts would disappear and be composed into peace. "The sting of the problem," says Hoernle, "lies just in this, that we cannot say that all the truth is on one side and all the error on the other, though this way has often been tried. There is truth on both sides. Both science and religion are well-founded in the nature of

things. Yet Reality cannot be ultimately at war with itself. And, thus, a reconciliation has to be sought by an examination of the conditions and limitations of each of these two conflicting thought-worlds."[2]

It may now be said that this solution of our problem is little more than a learned appearance and pretense and an empty show and boast of a solution, for it leaves us just where we started with the whole problem yet to be worked out. Anyone will admit that all our minds would find themselves in harmony if he is allowed to furnish the mind; and this solution solves nothing but leaves us still entangled in all the original difficulty and distress. There is no prospect that universal human agreement will ever be reached in any field, least of all in the conflict between religion and science, and so this solution leaves us with the certainty that the ancient warfare between old faith and new knowledge will go on to the end of time.

This contention is largely true. No one thinks that he or any thinker or all thinkers can solve and settle this conflict, and it must go on. This must be true, for no sooner do we settle the problem at one point than our very solution opens new problems that precipitate new conflicts, and thus the disease feeds on the very medicine that is administered as its cure. This is inherent in the adventure and search of finite inquiring minds in a growing world of knowledge and there is no escaping this process and we should not desire to avoid it.

Nevertheless, we have made some progress towards the solution of our problem in this view of the unity of the world. This has laid bare the root of the trouble and its remedy, and the diagnosis of a disease is often the main condition of its cure. It has given us an insight into the nature of the difficulty and opened the way to its solution. This solution is a slow process that must be worked out point by point in concrete cases, and always the aim and effort of such solution is to find the deeper unity underlying the conflicting views and to bring them into closer adjustment with it. As varying views, however widely separated and fiercely antagonistic they may be, approach this deeper unity they will approach each

---

[2] *Idealism as a Philosophy*, p. 228.

other as the spokes of a wheel converge towards the hub and touch at the common center.

Such adjustments are being constantly worked out, and our duty and ideal should be to work along this line patiently and hopefully and sympathetically with other workers, however widely we may seem to be divergent from them. We shall never reach the end of the process and arrive at final agreement because no sooner do we compose one divergence in a larger truth than we catch sight of a still deeper division, and never shall our search attain unto that final reality and central splendor where all truths meet and blend in the infinite unity of the omniscience of God.

3. Religion Needs Science

Religion and science not only are to be reconciled as harmonious parts of larger truth, but they must be brought into working relations as coöperative and mutually helpful friends. Religion needs science and science needs religion, as coworkers to supplement each other. Either without the other is one-sided and defective and may be as a bird or an airplane with only one wing. Religion needs science for three reasons.

(1) *To Be Imbued with the Scientific Spirit.* We have already seen that this is the spirit of the love of truth and of sympathy and humility. It is the opposite of the dogmatic spirit that settles all things with an imperious air and high hand, impelled headlong and blinded by its own partisanship and passion, little regardful of and still less hampered by facts. This spirit has been a danger and at times a disgrace in the history of religious thought and it has not yet wholly passed out of the religious world. It seems so easy to prove your point when all you have to do is to assert it loudly and incessantly. But truth is not won in this way in any field and this method will not work long in religion. Nowhere else are there stronger and more subtle influences at work to sway the judgment than in religion, and so nowhere else is there greater need for the scientific spirit than in this field. Theology has not always walked humbly with its God, much less with facts, or with the God of things as they are. Science begets this spirit and diffuses it like an atmosphere into all neighboring fields and thus tempers the intel-

lectual climate in which religion must grow. In time it becomes no longer respectable for theology to persist in outworn dogmatic methods when the scientific spirit pervades all other modes of thinking. When young people go to school and college and then return to their homes to hear unscientific traditional teaching in the pulpit and the Sunday school they unconsciously turn or openly revolt against it.

Science at this point, however unfriendly and destructive it may seem to some, is clearing the way for religion and is its best friend. It has swept swarms of noxious superstitions, such as witches and demons, out of our sky, and has laid its axe at the root of many errors that are really destructive of religion. It has forced theology to free itself from mere dogmatism and to use scientific methods of impartial and thorough investigation and to apply the severest critical tests to its own documents and doctrines. It has rendered and is rendering this service to religion, and for this friendly service religion owes to science its continuance and growth in our modern world.

(2) *For Constructive Material in Theology.* The whole search of science is to clear up the apparent tangled jungle and chaos of nature into order and law and purpose. Everywhere, whether walking amidst the majestic spaces and speeds and magnitudes and mysteries of the heavens, or deciphering the hieroglyphics of geological records, or peering into the infinitesimal microcosm of the atom, or tracing the evolution of biological organisms, it is seeking to find their causal connections and rational explanations, and in all this it is contributing materials and evidences of enormous value to theistic philosophy and natural theology. If science did not find a world of law and order that matched religion's concept of God, science would put such a God out of business and drive him from such a world. But science discovers and furnishes the very world that the God of religion must have and thereby it establishes His everlasting throne.

The Bible itself incorporates in its direct revelation of God much of this material as is seen in the Nineteenth Psalm. Systematic theology also builds natural theology along with Biblical theology into its composite system. All truth comes from God as its eternal source and goes back to God as illumination of His person and

character, works and ways. Science is converging all its light upon God, setting Him in the midst of all its splendors and filling out and enriching our concept of Him. We now can exclaim as no ancient prophet could say, "Our God is a great God," and "the small whisper" of the Hebrew psalmist is now turning into thunder in our ears.

Thus religion ever needs science to keep it from wandering into the wilderness and jungle of unscientific views and superstitions and to guide it through the world of factual reality, and it should ever appreciate and welcome its service.

(3) *For Practical Help in Its Work.* Religion is not simply a doctrine, but a doctrine rushing into deed. It is not a vision all up in the air, but a program of action that achieves victories down in the world. St. John saw the city of God coming down out of heaven upon the earth, and a city is our human world burgeoning into its most glorious flower, or raised to its highest degree of law and safety, sanitation and education, architecture and art, health and holiness, however far it may fall below this ideal. The building of this city is the meaning and aim and effort of all our religious worship and work.

This work calls for knowledge, insight and foresight, mastery of means and methods, dominion over all the earth. Such knowledge is science and it is a necessary and powerful means of building such a world. Science is the mother of invention. Science secretes civilization. All of our arts and magic machines grow out of it as leaves and fruit out of a tree. Edison never could have invented the electric light had not such pioneers as Faraday and Franklin gone before and penetrated the jungle of nature and caught and tamed this elusive force, which Edison and other electrical inventors then hitched to their wagons. This is but a single instance of countless such conquests wrought by science. It has caught all the subtle forces of nature and trained them into nimble servants. It has multiplied the variety and abundance of our foods, built sanitary homes, enormously facilitated travel and trade, flashed our thought and our very speech on the wings of lightning, pierced mountains, bridged rivers and the very seas, conquered the air, poured all material goods upon us in plentiful showers, and built our whole vast splendid material civilization. It is mastering

medicine, exterminating plagues, curing diseases and has increased the safety and comfort and lengthened the days of our human life. All these children of science are still in the swaddling clothes of infancy, and science will yet work wonders of which we have not even dreamed.

Let it be admitted that this material progress does not go very deep and may actually intensify some human evils. At some points it may not seem to have much to do with religion and may even be working against it. Nevertheless, no one can fail to see that science is an incalculable power for human welfare and has had much to do with lifting our civilization out of the slime of savagery and the jungle of superstition. This work is a necessary part of building the kingdom of God in the world. While this kingdom is primarily spiritual, yet it is also necessarily rooted down in material conditions, even as the human spirit is incarnated in the body. Religion with all its faith and hope would be practically helpless to turn its vision into victory if it did not have and use science as its helper. Religion cannot preach and propagate its gospel or even print it in a book without this means.

It is folly, then, for religion to turn upon science and attempt to cast it out as an enemy or to hamper it as a suspicious thing to be watched. If religion could kill science, it would by the same act kill itself; it would literally commit suicide.

And so religion needs science to impart to it the right spirit of truth-seeking, to furnish it with materials to construct its system of thought, and to arm it with the means and methods of building its new and better world.

4. Science Needs Religion

The needs and obligations existing between science and religion are not one-sided, but are mutual.

(1) *Reverence for Spiritual Realities.* As science may impart to religion its scientific spirit of truth-seeking, so may religion in turn impart to science its spirit of insight into and reverence for spiritual realities. Science by its very occupation of dealing with exact measurements and quantities in the field of things is in danger of growing narrow in its vision and rigid in its horizon and suspicious

and skeptical if not contemptuous of everything outside its field, especially in the sphere of religion. It deals so exclusively with the material that it tends to become materialistic and moves so constantly among things that are seen and temporal that it may become indifferent and blind to the things that are unseen and eternal. William James remarks on this narrow and purblind vision of men of science. "Of all insufficient authorities," he says, "as to the total nature of reality, give me the scientists. Their interests are most incomplete and their professional conceit and bigotry immense."[3] To the same effect writes Robert A. Millikan: "Science is just as often misrepresented as is religion by men of little vision, of no appreciation of its limitations, and of imperfect comprehension of the real rôle it plays in human life—by men who lose sight of spiritual values and therefore exert an influence upon youth which is unsettling, irreligious and sometimes immoral."[4] This state of mind, however, is contrary to their scientific spirit of truth-seeking, for this must not draw limiting circles and build boundary walls around any field of reality and refuse to look beyond, for it is under obligation by its very profession to seek to know and to be hospitable towards all truth in all fields. Religion is part of reality, if in no other sense than that it is an indubitable part of human experience and no small but an immense and universal part. Therefore, for a man of science to stand aloof from it in a spirit of suspicion and hostility towards it is to stultify his own profession of interest in and search for truth.

Religion has an eye of faith to see beyond the seen and a spirit of humility and reverence to stand in awe of the mystery of the universe. Science should share in this spirit and seek to exercise it that it may be true to its own calling even as science. For it to exhibit any attitude of indifference and flippancy and scorn towards any field of human interest is itself unscientific. The scientist also should exclaim, "I am a man, and nothing human is foreign to me." Especially should he stand in awe before the complexity and infinitude of the universe, and every undevout scientist, along with the undevout astronomer, is mad. Science

[3] *Life and Letters,* Vol. II, p. 270.
[4] *Science and Life,* p. 42.

may acquire this spirit of reverence in a greater degree from religion.

(2) *Deeper Insight into the World.* Science needs religion to obtain deeper insight into the vaster spiritual world in which the phenomenal world lies ensphered and in the light of which it is explained. Science cannot pursue its search far before it comes to a limit beyond which it as science cannot go. In general it is limited to the phenomenal world, but this field cannot be explained in terms of its own elements and laws. Science tends strongly towards a mechanistic view of the world, and yet mechanism can never make and start and operate its own mechanism. The world of science runs on across its own borders into a spiritual world of mind and plan and purpose and personality as inevitably as Niagara rushes over its precipice and seeks the sea. Notwithstanding its immense and splendid achievements and multitudinous practical benefits, science has no ultimate explanation of its own facts and is a blind guide leading the blind if it has no light but that which glimmers out of the world of space and time. It needs a larger world of spirit and personality and purpose to explain and fertilize its own field as certainly as the soil of the earth needs the sunshine and showers of the sun and sky. Thus as science runs on into philosophy and religion is its own world lifted into larger relations and its fragmentary reality rounded out to completion.

(3) *To Give the Human World Essential Worth.* Science needs religion to give our human world essential worth and eternal hope. Descriptive science does not deal with values and reach any final explanation, and so it does not attain the summits of the human world where all things are evaluated and everlasting destiny looms into view. Yet it cannot help but wistfully glance up to the heights and must share in the universal interest of these ultimate questions. Religion dwells on these heights, but it also descends to the lower levels with its spiritual visions and gives to science higher interest and dignity and value. If our human life is only mechanism and mud, it is hardly worth while to understand its mechanism and analyze its mud. But if the lower things of the world lead up to the things of the spirit, the lower itself partakes of the higher values and the material is glorified by the spiritual.

Again we arrive at the conclusion that religion and science are

not enemies but friends and coworkers in the field of human betterment. The religious seer and the scientific investigator should respect each other and work together in harmony, and then they will see eye to eye and work hand in hand in lifting the world out of darkness into light and will verily together build the kingdom of God in the world. When they fail to do this they fall out with all the distressing consequences of fratricidal strife. "It is a sad sight," says Professor Charles A. Seymour, of the Yale Divinity School, "to see a physicist come out of his laboratory, with the standards and habits which befit his work, and go up on to that high tableland where the spirit struggles with its mighty problems and destiny, to pass pontifical judgments which only reveal his own limitations. On the other hand, the scientist can suffer no more exquisite torture than to hear a theologian, who evidently knows nothing of the care needed to establish even the simplest fact, make sweeping generalizations." These dogmatists bring both science and religion into disrepute and they in no small degree have been the cause of the long unhappy conflict between these two fundamental fields of thought. Both of these classes are now happily passing, such prejudice and partisanship are no longer respectable and are becoming obsolete in the scholarly world, and both old faith and new knowledge are beginning to understand each other better and to respect each other's rights and results and to work together in harmony. Our main task is to show this at successive points on the frontiers along which religion and science impinge and overlap.

We may conclude this section with illustrative quotations from a representative scientist and a representative theologian in which they define and delimit the fields of science and religion.

Professor Ray Lankester authoritatively speaks for the scientists as follows: "The whole order of nature, including living and lifeless matter, from man to gas, is a network of mechanism, the main features and many details of which have been made more or less obvious to the wondering intelligence of mankind by the labor and ingenuity of scientific investigators. But no sane man has ever pretended, since science became a definite body of doctrine, that we know or ever can hope to know or conceive of the possibility of knowing whence this mechanism came, why it is here, whither it is

going, and what may or may not be beyond and beside it which our senses are not capable of appreciating.'' [5]

We shall let the Rev. Dr. Raymond Calkins speak for the theologians:

''It is where the scientist leaves off that the theologian begins. The theologian waits until the scientist gets through. He never interrupts him, and he never fears him. When he gets through, he has left the theologian plenty of room, plenty to do. For he may have answered the question, How? and he may have answered the question, When? but he has left unanswered the questions, Why? and Whence? and Whither? Theology does not need to dispute science on its own ground, because it has an undisputed territory which is all its own.'' [6]

These representative views are succinctly combined by the eminent physicist, Robert A. Millikan, in the following statement: ''The purpose of science is to develop a knowledge of the facts, laws, and processes of nature. The still more important task of religion is to develop the consciences, ideals, and aspirations of mankind.''

5. Ways of Knowing the World

The human self is a complex organism having various functions that react on the world each in its own way and yield each its own kind of knowledge or experience. Science observes the phenomenal world in its factual existences and relations, tracing its laws and operations, and its aim and ideal is pure factual truth. The scientist interprets the world in terms of his mind, his sense of logical relations, of cause and effect, law and system. The economist in interpreting the world introduces another element of judgment, his sense of value or the satisfying power of objects. He also is interpreting it in terms of his sense of need and use, and this element of value pervades all kinds of experience but especially grows dominant on its higher levels. The artist interprets the world from another point of view with other standards of judgment or in terms of his esthetic nature. He discerns beauty in the world, its sym-

[5] Quoted by Robert F. Horton, in *The Capacity for God,* pp. 61-62.
[6] *The Eloquence of Christian Experience,* p. 96.

metry and system, form and feature and color, its picturesqueness, majesty and sublimity and mystery, all producing in him the feeling of wonder akin to worship. With Wordsworth he feels

> A presence that disturbs him with a joy.
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns.

This emotional interpretation of the world in terms of the self other than that of science is equally valid. In fact, it may penetrate deeper into the secret of nature than science. As Browning asserts,

> The rest may reason and welcome,
> 'Tis we musicians know.

The scientist looks on a daisy and says it is "a low scapose asteraceous plant," but the poet says to it:

> With little here to do or see
> Of things that in the great world be,
> Daisy! again I talk to thee,
> For thou art worthy.

The scientist also adds that the daisy is "a troublesome weed," but the poet again addresses it:

> Methinks that there abides in thee
> Some concord with humanity,
> Given to no other flower I see
> The forest through!

and declares,

> To me the meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.

The scientist looks out over the ocean and says that it is H_2O, but the poet looks and exclaims,

> Roll on, thou deep and dark blue Ocean, Roll!

and rather than be so "out of tune with Nature" that "It moves us not" and we can see only H_2O, he declares:

> Great God! I'd rather be
> A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn:
> So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,

Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;
Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea;
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathèd horn.

Which of these, scientist or poet, has the deepest insight into and the richest reaction to the world? Which has the worthiest and best knowledge of it?

The soul's reaction on right and wrong in the social human world is its conscience, another valid and vital kind of knowledge. The soul's most comprehensive and profoundest reaction to the world is its religious sense by which it experiences dependence on a higher Power and immanent Spirit and seeks fellowship with God. All other kinds of knowledge are gathered up into this relation to the infinite and eternal Reality and the whole universe becomes a giant altar of aspiration and worship. To deny this relation is to fly in the face of the oldest and most universal and persistent kind of human reaction to the world.

Each of these kinds of knowledge interprets some special aspect of the world in terms of some particular activity and need of the soul, and each rests upon the same logical basis and is valid and vital to a full-orbed human life. The world when interpreted in terms of our intellectual nature yields truth; of our esthetic nature, yields beauty; of our moral nature, yields goodness; and of our spiritual nature, yields religion. Truth and beauty and goodness, conscience and character and worship—these are the essential and supreme goods of life.

Of course, it is understood that these various faculties or functions of the soul must be used critically so as to free them as far as possible from personal and subjective error. All tests must be applied to them, logical and experimental and coherent, and through sufficient periods of time. It is also obvious that all these functions of the soul operate together and are fused into unity in all its activities. No one of them can be isolated from the others and be made to work in a separate chamber. The whole personality acts on the world and experiences these varied and rich reactions. The scientist in perceiving logical relations in the world cannot escape some feeling of their beauty and will not fail to react to right and wrong in his human relations and will surely have

some sense of reverence as he uncovers the majesty and mystery of the universe.

So also the artist bases his interpretation of the world on the strictest scientific principles and knowledge. The moralist must immerse his ethics in the social world. And the religious thinker and worshiper taxes all fields of experience to construct his creed and order his life. He builds his spiritual temple and all its cloud-capped towers down on the lowly earth and finds the earth itself crammed with heaven. All these fields of knowledge are also suffused with various degrees of value, and in fact it is our sense of value that gives them their interest.

All these reactions to the world are interrelated and cohere into unity. Thought and feeling and will, truth and beauty and goodness and worship, all spring from the constitution and needs of the soul and interpret the world from these various points of view and in terms of these functions. They are mutually dependent and science cannot say to art, "I have no need of thee," and science and art cannot say to religion, "We have no need of thee," nor can religion say unto science or art, "I have no need of thee." These kinds of experience are the notes of the musical scale of the self and they blend into harmony and become the grand chorus and song of the soul as it responds to the infinite orchestra and symphony of the universe.

A question of special interest to us arises at this point: Are scientific knowledge and religious knowledge equally valid, not to say vital, in our human experience? Bertrand Russell is sure they are not and declares that our scientific knowledge is a valid interpretation of the world but that our sentimental or emotional interpretation of it is not valid.[7] But the two kinds of knowledge rest, as we have been showing, on the same fundamental basis. Mr. Russell in his science interprets the world in terms of mind, of his intellectual nature and principles and needs, and in like manner the artist and the worshiper interpret the world in accordance with their esthetic and religious natures and needs, and their interpretation, therefore, rests on the same logical basis and validity as the

[7] In his lecture on "What I Believe," based on his book with the same title.

scientific method. Mr. Russell interprets the universe in terms of one part of human nature and field of experience and then denies the same right of interpretation in terms of other parts of our complex nature and needs. He uses his principle as far as it suits him, and then refuses the use of the same principle to others.

Science does give us valid knowledge of one part or aspect of the universe, but not of the whole. It cannot see through its most powerful telescopes or microscopes or weigh on its most delicate scales the things of the spiritual world. It can weigh the mother and her child, but not the mother's love for her child. The physical world, it is generally seen and said by philosophers and even by scientists, is only a part and probably a small part of the total world, the outer shell but not the inner spirit that gives the universe its real existence and meaning and value. Mr. Russell's way of knowing the world is true and good as long as he uses it positively, but he forsakes his own basic principle when he refuses to the artist and the religious thinker and worshiper the use of the same method in their fields.

Mr. Russell gives two reasons for validating scientific but invalidating the religious interpretation of the world. His first reason is that science can predict the world but emotion cannot. But does this distinction hold good? The fact is that when science does venture to predict it does so by faith and not by certain knowledge, for it has no certainty that the sun will not literally explode, after the manner of novæ or new stars, and blow the solar system to pieces and dissolve it into gas the next hour or minute, and thus utterly obliterate all the predictions of science along with the scientist himself. All the predictions of science are only approximations and probabilities and frequently enough they partially fail or miss altogether. And is it true that sentiment cannot predict? Patriotism is a sentiment and it can predict with great certainty what it will do when a foe invades the country, though the invasion may be as far from our shores as the English channel. Love is an emotion of the heart, and what is more certain than what it will do in certain conditions? As between the logical predictions of the brain and the emotional impulses of the heart, the world depends more on the latter than on the former. This distinction will not insure validity to science and deny it to religion.

Mr. Russell's second objection to the validity of an emotional interpretation of the universe is that it is only an expression of our subjective desires whereas science is an interpretation of objective reality. , Science tells us what the world is, but religion only tells us what we want it to be. Religion is thus an enormous piece of egoism that puts us in the center of the universe and supposes that its only purpose is to minister to us, to nurse us in its cradle and keep us comfortable and satisfied and hush our crying when we are in trouble. As an illustration of this point he instances the case of a cow in a meadow which runs off in fright when a train passes by and then supposes that the purpose of the train is to scare it away. The illustration is catching and at first may seem conclusive as proving that we are no better than the cow in our philosophy when we suppose the universe was made for us and has us in view. However, an illustration may be a dangerous thing when it may refute the very point it was intended to prove and kicks back and hoists a brilliant thinker with his own petard.

The way to meet this illustration is boldly to say that the cow is right in its supposed philosophy. What is the cow doing? It is interpreting the train in terms of its own experience in supposing that the train was constructed to frighten it away. And was not this very thing intended in the construction of the train? One part of it is still called "the cowcatcher," which, as its name implies, was expressly designed to drive cows off its track, and the whistle is also in part a device to scare cows and other foolish creatures, such as "joy-riders," away from danger. The train is really friendly to the cow whatever its fears. Clearly one purpose of the train is to do the very thing the cow supposes it was made to do, and so far the cow is right in the philosophy Mr. Russell obligingly imputes to it. If, now, the cow were to go on and think that the only purpose of the train is to scare it away, it would reach the limit of absurdity.

The application is plain. One purpose of the universe is to minister to us in our complex life, physical and mental and moral, esthetic and religious, for as a matter of fact it does do this and we may rightly infer that it is constructed and operated to do what it does do. So far we agree with the cow. As the train is friendly to the cow so may we believe the universe is friendly to us. If, now,

we were to go on and say that the only purpose of the universe is to respond to our interpretations and needs, we would also be as foolish and absurd as the cow in our philosophy and religion. We should have considerable respect for Mr. Russell's cow and thank him for it, for its supposed philosophy is right as far as it goes; and we are not in bad company when we interpret the universe with our higher powers and needs on the same principle as it interprets the train.

As Mr. Russell draws near the end of his lecture he seems to feel that it is difficult if not impossible to carry on our life on the basis of scientific knowledge alone. He moves into the region of values and says they are ultimate realities and that in this domain every man is his own king. It would seem, however, that in doing this he is slipping from the basis of scientific knowledge and planting himself on the ground of sentiment which he had already invalidated. He gets into still deeper trouble in discussing good and evil, which he had relegated to the region of subjective interpretation. He now reaches the position of saying that the great need of the world is salvation through knowledge and love. Scientific knowledge, he assures us, will drive fear out of the world, and then love will come in as universal good-will and harmonize society and reach "salvation."

His view on this practical side of philosophy is one way of stating the truth. Perfect knowledge and perfect love doubtless would give us a perfect world. But can science give us either? Mr. Russell is sure about science but does not make it clear how we are to get perfect love. We may doubt his confident faith in science, which really seems as dogmatic as the faith of any theologian. Does science drive all fear out of the world and ought it to do so? It does expel some fears and brings others in. It banishes demons and witches but discloses deadly microbes in our blood and stretches over and around us wires charged with fatal currents of electricity. Science did not prevent the last war but only enormously increased its slaughter, and it is now inventing other deadly weapons that will still further terribly increase the devastation of the next war. Science is only a powerful tool which bad men can use as destructively as good men can employ it usefully. We have great need of and hope in science, but it is not the saviour of the

world. Love has little relation to science or to knowledge of any kind, and as to how to get it science has little to say. It seems, however, that Mr. Russell in putting so much emphasis on love at the end of his lecture, is forgetting how he invalidated "sentiment" and "emotion" at its beginning.

Here is where science reaches the end of its road. Useful as it is as a means of interpreting the universe and multiplying the necessities and comforts of life, when it comes to the higher things of the spirit its light fails. Here is where religion takes up the problem and opens heavenly visions that satisfy our spiritual needs and give us life more abundant and everlasting.

Our conclusion at this point is that all our ways of knowing the world are based on our fundamental constitution and needs, such as science and art and religion, and are valid and vital to a full and rich and satisfying life.

CHAPTER V

MODERN VIEWS OF THE BIBLE

We propose presently to trace our problem through the Bible, noting how old faith and new knowledge grew together through its development, but before entering upon this study we shall first consider modern views of the book itself.

1. The Processes of Modern Criticism

The climatic changes that the scientific spirit has swept over all fields, producing our modern knowledge, has not spared the Bible. It is not a book that could be kept immune in a sealed cell or glass case, but it has been forced to come out into the open and bare its breast to every wind and storm that blows and submit to the same tests that are applied to every other book and doctrine. Its sacredness could not shield it from the searching investigation that has revolutionized science and history and every field of knowledge. It is a book of fact and history and doctrine, and all its contents had to be put through the processes of criticism that the truth about it might be discovered and established.

In particular the facts as to its origin and authorship had to be investigated by modern methods. The traditional view has been that these facts have been certainly known from ancient times. Even the statements of authorship given in the titles of its various books have been taken at their face value as though they were inspired along with the books themselves. The simple fact that in the English Bible the first book is named "The First Book of Moses Called Genesis" was taken as an authoritative declaration and final settlement of the Mosaic authorship of Genesis and so with the whole Pentateuch and many other books of the Bible.

When it became known that these titles generally are not found in the oldest manuscripts and are no part of the books but are

later additions by unknown editors, this was seen to be a revolutionary fact that swept away many traditional views as to their authorship and threw the whole question of their origin open to investigation. It was further seen that few of the books of the Bible announce their authorship and this again opened the question of their origin.

And so historical criticism has gone through the books of the Bible endeavoring to discover their authorship and order of production, the environment and circumstances of their time and the purpose of their authors in writing them. Involved in the same process has been the question of the accuracy and trustworthiness of the authors as tested by modern methods.

This criticism has resulted after more than a hundred years of study in general agreement among scholars as to the main facts, and this critical knowledge has become popularized so that it is widely diffused, and it has largely shaped our modern views of the Bible. It does not fall within the range of our study to enter upon a detailed examination of the processes and results of this criticism, but a summary view of them as bearing upon our problem will be indicated.

2. The Old Testament

Modern criticism has been most radical and revolutionary in its treatment of the Old Testament because it is older and was produced in a distant time and in ages where its origin is less open to view and when historical and literary standards were different from ours.

The general result of this study has been to assign most of the books of the Old Testament to other times and authors than the traditional ones. The Pentateuch is now held to be a composite work consisting of four documents, each marked with distinctive characteristics, produced at different times and ages, which subsequent editors have woven together, and it assumed its final form after the Exile in Babylon, probably at the hands of Ezra. Moses is thus not the author of it, yet it was and is called by his name because he is the chief figure in it and because its fundamental ideas and possibly some of its literary materials go back to him. Isaiah

falls apart at Chapter 40 into two main parts, the first of which was produced by the prophet Isaiah living in Jerusalem, and the second part a hundred and fifty years later by another great prophet down in Babylon in the Exile, and to suppose that the first Isaiah wrote the second part of the book is like supposing that Cromwell wrote Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Daniel falls about 168 B. C., in the time of the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, where it fits in like a key in its lock. Other books, including many of the Psalms, Chronicles, Jonah, Ecclesiastes, Job and Proverbs, fall in post-Exilic times.[1] The evidence for these processes and for some of these results lies upon the surface of these books and is visible even to English readers, and the results have the practically unanimous support of modern scholars.

The total effect of these changes is variously viewed by different students and schools of thought, but the problem is being gradually worked out and it is seen that these results have not unfavorably affected the religious trustworthiness and teaching of the Old Testament, but have really placed it on a more solid foundation of fact and gives us a far truer and more useful understanding of it. These changes are largely modifications of traditional views that were not found in or supported by the Old Testament itself, and when we get used to them, as we have to many other and even greater changes, as in the case of the Copernican astronomy and modern geology, we find them comfortable enough and then have the assurance that we have a more critically tested and a more secure and better book.

We close this very brief examination of the results of higher criticism as applied to the Old Testament with a quotation from a competent authority in a recent composite work that is of high general authority covering the whole ground of modern views of the Bible:

> Higher criticism is an interesting and at times a fascinating study. But it is always a means to an end, never an end in itself. It must take a subordinate position as the handmaid of exegesis, and the Biblical student needs to bear in mind the fact that the final aim is more important than the method. It may well be that a later age with clearer vision and deeper in-

[1] No account is taken in these general statements of subordinate points, such as further subdivisions in composite books.

sight than ours will detect our mistakes and find better solutions for our difficulties than we have reached. But for us it remains true that the attempt, imperfect and incomplete as it may be, has brought a fresh illumination. We have been able to trace the divine scheme of revelation and the divine method of training with a distinctness and a convincing continuity which would otherwise have failed us, and we look forward to yet greater achievements in generations to come. We are "persuaded that God has yet more light to break out unto us from His holy word."[2]

3. The New Testament

Modern criticism as applied to the New Testament has not been less thorough in its methods but it has been less radical in its reconstruction and results. No revolutionary changes have resulted from the critical study of this part of the Bible and its structure stands very much as it was before.

(1) *Order of Production of the Books.* The order of production of the books of the New Testament has long been known even to popular readers to have been different from their present printed order. The first book written was one of Paul's Epistles, either Galatians or I Thessalonians, and his other Epistles and all the other books of the New Testament were of later production, and some of them are of more or less uncertain date and authorship, though all of them with possibly one or two exceptions fall well within the first century and the Synoptic Gospels go back within a third of a century of the death of Christ.

The first four of Paul's Epistles are of undisputed authorship so that here we stand on solid historic ground, and the others, with the possible exception of I Timothy, are also generally accepted by scholars as from his hand. The Acts of the Apostles is generally admitted to be from the hand of Luke, as he was a traveling companion of Paul and slips into his narrative himself in the well-known "we" passages beginning with chapter 16:10. Luke was a physician, scholar and painstaking writer, as we shall see further. We may, therefore, use the Acts and Paul's Epistles as trustworthy historical sources.

(2) *Dates of the Four Gospels.* An important question in our

[2] Dr. T. H. Robinson, "The Methods of Higher Criticism," Chapter V, p. 182, in *The People and the Book,* Edited by Arthur S. Peake.

study are the dates of the four Gospels, as these books lie at the foundation of historic Christianity. These dates have been brought within narrow early limits by modern criticism, and this is one of its most important results. The Fourth Gospel is admittedly much later than the three Synoptics, and the question of its authorship is a complicated one. There are strong grounds for dating it at the end of the first century and ascribing it to John the disciple, and this authorship is accepted by many scholars, though some attribute its authorship to John the Presbyter; but all admit its historical value, and there has been in recent years a tendency back to the Johannine authorship.

More important still are the dates of the three Synoptic Gospels, and they are so interrelated and linked together that their dates become a common problem. Are these vital documents in the life of Jesus so late and enveloped in the mist of tradition and uncertainty that we cannot trust them on the essential facts of his life? This is not at all the situation in which they are involved, and here we can build on the ground of reasonable assurance.

A base line at this point is the date of the Acts of the Apostles. This book is practically a biography of Paul, and Luke closes it with Paul in prison in Rome waiting for his trial, obviously closing his narrative at this point for the reason that there was nothing more about Paul at that time to tell. Paul perished under Nero and probably in the Neronian persecution of 64 A. D., and as Luke wrote the Acts before this death and date we may date this book at 62 A. D. But Luke wrote the Acts, as its preface shows, after he wrote his Gospel, and we may, therefore, date the Third Gospel at about 60 A. D. Comparison of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew with Mark shows that these two writers used Mark, following his order and incorporating nearly all of his material in their narratives, and therefore the date of Mark falls between 50 and 60 A. D. This line of reasoning and these dates are supported by the weighty authority of Harnack and other scholars. We are now back to within twenty-five years of the death of Jesus, and this excludes legend and myth and gives us good historical ground.

But Luke, in the Preface to his Gospel, tells us that he had in hand many narratives of the life of Jesus written by those who had received their knowledge from those "who from the beginning were

eyewitnesses and ministers of the word," and that he himself had traced the history accurately from the first in order that he might write a systematic account of it to confirm the faith of his friend Theophilus. This is an exceedingly valuable part of Luke's Gospel and assures us, not only that he was not simply depending upon and repeating second-hand sources and traditions, but that he had investigated the subject with the thoroughness of a scholarly historian and that he had as the basis of his narrative many sketches or outlines of the life of Jesus written by those who were themselves eyewitnesses or were in touch with them. He thus based his history on contemporary witnesses and documents after the approved method of the modern scientific historian. This Preface of Luke, worth many times its weight in gold as a historical authority, takes us back to and puts in our hands the testimony of eyewitnesses of the events in the life of Jesus. Even though all the Synoptics were dated considerably later, yet would this little Preface of Luke to the Third Gospel assure us that its author had trustworthy sources in his hand as the basis of his narrative.

As to personal nearness to, and connection with, the events of the gospel history, two of the Gospels, Matthew and John, are attributed to disciples of Jesus, two of the original Twelve who spent three years in the public ministry and private companionship of their Master. There is good reason for accepting them as the genuine writings of these disciples, and they are received generally by scholars as having come either from them directly or from those who were closely associated with them. Mark is attributed to a young man who lived in Jerusalem in the days of Jesus and was afterward associated with both Paul and Peter, and he is accepted as the author of the earliest of our Gospels and a trustworthy authority. Luke and the Acts were written by Luke, a professional scholar and historian, who traveled with Paul and was present with him at Jerusalem, where he met James the brother of the Lord (Acts 21:18), and thus he had an opportunity of learning from eyewitnesses the facts as to the life of Jesus. Paul, whose Epistles are accepted as genuine, was converted to belief in the risen Jesus, whose name he was trying to stamp out in blood, only about a year after his resurrection, and three years after his conversion Paul spent fifteen days in Jerusalem where he went to "visit" or "cross-

examine'' Peter and James and John and thus had direct access to the witnesses and facts in the case which he was investigating (Gal. 1:16). Better authenticated evidence of the life and resurrection of Jesus could not well be asked.

(3) *Features of the Gospel Narratives.* An outstanding feature of the Gospel narratives is that they have none of the inevitable and inescapable marks of imagination and myth, invention and legend, vision and ecstasy, which are careless of order and system, causes and consequences, and unmindful and unconscious of contradictions and impossibilities as they weave all sorts of incongruities and absurdities into the subjective fabric of preconceived beliefs and desires. These writers and witnesses do not lose touch with the earth and take to the wings of fancy; on the contrary, due allowance being made for the supernatural events they are relating, they keep down on the ground of sober reality and concrete details and observe the order and unity and harmony of normal human experience and historic fact. Facts are freely and frankly recorded that would have been carefully glossed over or suppressed in a partisan account or fictitious story. They tell things adverse to themselves and to their Master because they were telling the simple truth. In a word, these narratives have the simplicity and artlessness of truth, and these inimitable watermarks of veracity are so many seals authenticating the testimony of these witnesses and writers.

It is true that there are differences and discrepancies in their narratives, but these variations, though they may be overstrained and magnified into seemingly fatal contradictions, when properly considered are not serious disharmonies and are far removed from any conscious fraud or deception, but are what might have been expected and admit of explanation. These writers were not composing a systematic and comprehensive history of the life of Jesus and are not even trying to set forth facts to prove it, but are only giving personal experiences and impressions from their different points of view. And hence we have only disconnected incidents and fragments of the entire story, and it is not surprising that we cannot put these together so as to make them match all around their ragged edges when other parts are missing that might complete the harmonious whole.

These differences also in general are such as ought to be found in independent accounts. If the writers had all related the story in exactly the same way and words, this would throw suspicion on them all as having been in collusion. These individualistic variations in the form of testimony are one of the strongest indications of truthfulness.

(4) *Authors of the Bible Competent and Honest.* It may be said of the authors of the Bible as a whole that they were competent men with opportunities to know what they related and with honest intentions to tell us the things they saw or knew or believed to be true. That they were impostors or mere credulous and deceived story-tellers is not to be believed and is not borne out by their books that have long won and maintained a supreme place among scholars and in the religious world.

They were men of vision rather than of logic, especially the great prophets and apostles who had insight into spiritual truth. They were great poets who thought and spoke and wrote in figurative and imaginative terms, painting impressionistic pictures in broad outlines and strong colors. The poet and the painter are gifted with insight into the things of the spirit deeper than that of the man of cold logic and meticulous literality. These men stood near to the facts and on summits of vision where they caught gleams and bursts of spiritual light that never were on sea or land, and this fact stands untouched by modern criticism. The Bible, being a book of literature and not of science, contains every species of this complex and varied and iridescent product and expression of the human soul, and if it contains legend and myth and other primitive literary forms and mediums of truth its religious teaching and values are not impaired but are enriched thereby.

4. Some General Aspects of the Bible

There remain several general aspects of the Bible that bear closely upon our problem.

(1) *Development in the Bible.* It is now a commonplace principle in our modern views of the Bible that a process of development runs through it from beginning to end. It was not all struck out at once by one hand, but it is a library of sixty-six books. It

is a national literature. It was slowly produced, as diamonds are distilled and crystallized atom by atom, through a thousand years at the convergent and crowded crossroads of the ancient world where all civilizations and languages and religions met and flowed into it. Not only was Palestine compressed into its pages, but so also were Babylon and Egypt and Greece and Rome. All the world was taxed and rifled of its treasures to compose and enrich it. A great, many-sided, many-colored literature of the most gifted race religiously, it is the expressed essence of their history and experience. It is secreted out of the Hebrew soul. Historian and psalmist, prophet, and poet, emblazoned its pages with their pictures of the march of God through time, tossing impenitent nations out of His path, and with the most glorious visions and colors of their inspired imagination. The Hebrew was the most richly endowed child of God and yet was also the most wilful and wayward and passed through the deepest waters and the fiercest fires. He poured his burning, throbbing soul into this book so that it flames with his ardent dreams and hopes, is jubilant with his joys and triumphs, smeared and stained with his sins and tears, darkened with his tragedies, and sobs with his sorrows.

As a consequence, it is not all on a level of ethical worth and spiritual idealism. It includes every variety of literature, history and prophecy, prose and poetry, drama and fiction, parable and epistle, legend and folklore, gospel and apocalypse. It uses every medium for letting the light of God into the human heart and drawing out and expressing the human soul. It is a mighty organ with a multitude of pipes and many stops so that it can sing with the bird or crash with the thunder and voice all the myriad thoughts and emotions, needs and aspirations of the human spirit. It necessarily writes its messages in the speech and the thought-terms of its day. It speaks the language and reflects the customs and laws and science and civilization of its age. It paints the pictures on its pages with the colors of its time. As a necessary consequence, it cannot transcend the general level of its day in knowledge and art, science and philosophy, custom and law, social and political institutions, moral and spiritual ideas and ideals, and its early pages are discolored and blotted with low and crude moral practices, religious doctrines, concepts of God and modes of worship. Yet it

is ever moving out of lower into higher levels and is clarifying its vision and purifying its experience through the ages. Through it runs one increasing purpose and its thoughts are widened with the process of the suns.

The Bible is not, then, all to be judged from the same point of view and evaluated by the same standards. Abraham is on a lower level than Moses, Moses than David, David than Isaiah, and Isaiah than Paul. The whole Old Testament is on a lower level than the New and the Old is the rough root out of which grew and bloomed the New. This general fact will develop as we proceed with the application of our principle to the Bible.

(2) *Inspiration and Inerrancy.* The question of the inspiration of the Scriptures is an important one and yet it is not vital to our problem. The doctrine of inspiration is one that must be deduced from the Bible and not brought to the Bible and imposed upon it. It is not an *a priori* principle that determines what the Bible should be, but an *a posteriori* conclusion that shows what it is. We cannot use our doctrine of inspiration to determine our Bible, but we must use our Bible to determine our doctrine of inspiration.

The important thing about the Bible is not whether it is inspired, but whether it is true. It can have no higher authority than its truth, for truth is the supreme authority of any book or teaching, and if the Bible is true, inspiration can add nothing of importance to its authority. The Bible itself says little about its inspiration and its writers are mostly unaware of it.

Inspiration is evidently a matter of kind and degree. It does not always mean the same thing and does not proceed by the same method at different levels and in different portions of the Scriptures. Sometimes a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord and his very words are inspired, and yet these words were necessarily limited and determined in a degree by the prophet's own language and knowledge and time. But usually the writers of the Bible are proceeding under ordinary human conditions and are using ordinary human processes and are entirely unconscious of any special divine guidance. The idea of such guidance simply does not occur to them. At times God was breathing His Spirit into them by special inspiration and at other times He was guiding them by His ordinary providence. Ordinary providence evidently led the his-

torians of the Bible, including the writers of the Gospels. Luke in the Preface to his Gospel lets us see right into his literary workshop and into his mind: he is collecting and collating materials and original documents after the approved methods of the modern scientific historian. Paul never dreamed that he was writing an inspired letter that would be incorporated in the inspired Bible when he penned the little note to his friend Philemon pleading with him to receive the runaway slave Onesimus back into his house and fellowship; and doubtless it was so with all his letters.

There is little material in the Bible from which to construct a doctrine of inspiration. An important fact in this connection is that no writer of any book or portion of the Bible had any knowledge of the whole Bible as we now have it. The canon of both the Old and New Testaments was not assembled and completed until long after its various books were written, and so the Scriptures make no claim to inspiration in any part that can be applied to the whole, and, in fact, the Bible as a whole shows no conscious unity on any subject because the whole Bible did not exist for and was not known to the writer of any part of it.

As a consequence, no church has formulated an official definition and doctrine of inspiration and incorporated it in its creed. Such a definition is a difficult thing to draw up, and the discussion and formulation of the doctrine through the whole history of Christianity has been attended with wide differences of views and with much heat and little light. Nevertheless, in spite of the difficulty and the danger we venture to offer the following definition: The Bible is the book of religious revelation and guidance God made for us men and our salvation. This states the product of inspiration but not the process; it asserts the fact but leaves open the way it was done. It is parallel to the Scriptural statement of the creation of man: "Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." This also asserts the fact that God made man but leaves open the process by which he did it.

Paul gives a definition of inspiration that is framed on the same principle of product and not of process: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of

God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." Again we are given results and not processes. We may study the process and find out all we can about it from a complete induction of Scripture, but the important thing is the practical outcome and purpose of the Bible and not the kind and degree and method of the divine guidance by which it was inspired.

So the Bible is the book of religious guidance which God made for our salvation, and there we let the definition stand. It is the result of all our study of the Bible, drawn from the book and not imposed upon it. It is so orthodox that the most conservative theologian cannot object to it or find any flaw in it, and yet so broad and flexible that the most liberal Christian can find room in it for his view.

But does not inspiration imply inerrancy? The Bible itself makes no such claim and does not even raise the issue or become conscious of it. Some of the Reformers did hold to a verbally inspired Bible, and yet a competent scholar tells us: "Actually, however, both Luther and Calvin were compelled by facts to break away from the rigid dogma of verbal inspiration which they had inherited. Consistently or not, they faced the undeniable truth that in conveying to us the gift of the Bible, as the adequate and enduring presentation of His redeeming love, God has employed a series of human agencies, and that in the working of these agencies He has not excluded slight human imperfections. And so Luther and Calvin became, unwittingly or not, the precursors of the modern critical study of the Bible."[3]

Inerrancy is a dangerous claim to make, for if it be a true test of inspiration then, if a single error be discovered in the Bible, the whole book is destroyed. And who can say that there is no single error in the Bible? This claim cannot be made for our English Bible, for it is a translation abounding in inaccuracies which we are trying to correct by repeated new translations. It cannot be made of the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, for these are long since lost. There are in existence about 1,800 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, but only five of these go back

[3] Professor H. R. Mackintosh's chapter on "The Reformers' View of Scripture" contributed to Bishop Gore's *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, p. 59.

into the fourth century A. D., and these manuscripts contain about 300,000 variations and are, therefore, swarming with errors. Scholars try to remove these errors and construct as correct a text as they can, but no one thinks this reconstructed text is identical with the autograph copy, and our Revised Version of the Bible rests on no existing Hebrew or Greek manuscript but on a theoretical text the scholars themselves have made. Where, then, is our inspired inerrant Bible? It is not to be found; it is not in existence. On this theory of inspired inerrancy, we have no Bible and are of all men most miserable.

It does not meet this point to say, as the Presbyterian General Assembly declared in 1893: "Resolved, That the Bible as we now have it, in its various translations and versions, when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists, and printers, is the very Word of God, and consequently wholly without error."

This remarkable attempt at formulating a doctrine of inerrancy is shot through with inconsistency. Its grammar is bad and its logic limps and it only excited the ridicule of the scholarly world. Its grammar is wrong because its tenses do not hold together and it should read, "The Bible, . . . when freed from errors," . . . *will be* "wholly without error"; and, second, it is self-contradictory, for it starts with a Bible that admittedly contains "errors" and ends with the same Bible that *is* "wholly without error." Worst of all, it leaves us without any real Bible of any kind and gives us only an imaginary Bible that does not exist and cannot be proved ever to have existed. It makes a show of telling us that we have an inerrant Bible and at the same time cannot keep from telling us that we don't have it. It pretends to put in our hands an inerrant Bible and immediately takes it away from us and substitutes for it a fiction of dogmatic assertion. This resolution put both the Bible and the Presbyterian General Assembly that passed it in a pitiable plight only partially mitigated by the fact that a large minority containing some of the ablest men in that Assembly entered their protest against it, opposing this view, "Because it is setting up an imaginary Bible as a test of orthodoxy. If an inerrant original Bible is vital to faith, we cannot escape the conclusion that an inerrant present Bible is vital to faith. . . . It

seems to be flying for shelter to an original autograph, when the Bible we have in our hands to-day is our impregnable defense."

The doctrine of the Westminster standards is a sounder position and a surer authority. "The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience," and they "principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty requires of man," or they are, not inerrant as to matters extraneous to religion, but "the rule of faith and life."

There are errors in the Bible that evidently go back to the autograph manuscripts. Mark opens his Gospel, the very first one to be written, with a quotation which he says "is written in Isaiah the prophet," and yet the first half of it is not from Isaiah but from Malachi and only the second half is from Isaiah. Evidently Mark gave it from memory and mixed the two passages together, a common way of quoting Scripture yet, especially in theological classrooms. It will not do to say that this error is trivial and affects no doctrine, for it certainly does affect and destroys the doctrine of inerrancy. There are many such errors, not to speak of more serious ones in the Bible, and they are fatal to this theory, though they do not affect any vital doctrine taught in the Scripture itself. The theory is a vain device and it fares badly at the hands of intelligent study and honest scholarship. The most orthodox conservatives have seen and exposed the danger of this doctrine, and we shall give the views of several of them.

No other name has carried greater weight in conservative orthodox circles than that of Dr. Charles Hodge, the eminent scholar and theologian of Princeton Theological Seminary. In discussing inspiration he says that it "of course does not imply that the sacred writers were infallible except for the special purpose for which they were employed. They were not imbued with plenary knowledge. As to all matters of science, philosophy, and history, they stood on the same level with their contemporaries. They were infallible only as teachers, and when acting as the spokesmen of God. Their inspiration no more made them astronomers than it made them agriculturalists." "Apparent discrepancies, although numerous, are for the most part trivial." "No sane man would deny that the Parthenon was built of marble, even if here and there a speck

of sandstone should be detected in its structure. Not less unreasonable is it to deny the inspiration of such a book as the Bible, because one sacred writer says that on a given occasion twenty-four, and another says that twenty-three thousand were slain."[4]

No one has stood higher and more solidly as a tower of orthodoxy in the Presbyterian and other Protestant churches than Dr. Francis L. Patton, formerly President of Princeton University and later of Princeton Theological Seminary. In his recent book on *Fundamental Christianity,* from which we have already quoted, he writes freely and boldly against the theory of inerrancy. "It is a hazardous thing," he says, "to say that being inspired the Bible must be free from error; for then the discovery of a single error would destroy its inspiration. Nor have we any right to substitute the word 'inerrancy' for 'inspiration' in our discussion of the Bible unless we are prepared to show from the teaching of the Bible that inspiration means inerrancy—and that, I think, would be a difficult thing to do. This will serve to show how it is that some at the present day are saying that unless the Bible is without error it cannot be trusted for anything, and also how foolish such a statement is."[5]

The Rev. Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, a former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and a prominent Presbyterian fundamentalist, does not hold to an inerrant Bible and in his book entitled *Christianity and Common Sense* unequivocally makes his position clear. "When I said the Bible was an infallible guide," he writes, "I meant infallible as a spiritual guide," a position that modernists generally hold. Commenting on the discrepancy in the numbers slain in a battle as given in Kings and Chronicles he says, "I cannot make my regard for the Bible rest on whether ten thousand or a hundred thousand were slain. The whole matter is irrelevant" (p. 232). Speaking of the different accounts in Matthew and the Acts as to Judas and the field of blood and the mistake of Matthew in naming Jeremiah when his quotation was from Zechariah he says: "I wish you to understand, sir, that should you prove conclusively that Matthew

[4] *Systematic Theology,* Vol. I, pp. 165, 169, 170.
[5] Pages 163-64.

and Luke differ as to the history of Judas and that field of blood, you do not shake my faith in the Bible as my guide in Christian truth. Not the end of Judas, but the death of Christ, that is the main thing. If Matthew said Jeremiah instead of Zechariah, I'm not troubled in the least'' (pp. 233-234). Of course, these concessions carry with them the principle of errors in the Bible and only leave open the question of what they are, and this is the position of modernists on this point.

We give some quotations from an orthodox Anglican scholar, Bishop Charles Gore in his book on *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*:

> The point here insisted upon is that the acceptance of the principle of applying historical criticism to the documents of the New Testament does not, if the criticism is impartial and free from a dogmatic prejudice against anything supernatural or miraculous, result in impairing their testimony to the traditional creed of the Church. That remains secure. But it does impair the belief in the *infallibility* of the records in detail. There are mistakes in the Gospels and a great number of more or less important discrepancies of detail. Thus we return to the question which is the only object of this little book—Can you, if you accept criticism as freely to be applied to the Bible records, both of the Old and the New Covenant, still retain your belief in their inspiration? Or has the Church so tied the belief in inspiration to the idea of infallibility that in losing the second you lose also the first?[6] . . .
>
> The Church never attempted to *define* inspiration any more than it attempted to define the doctrine of the atonement. It did, in opposition to current ideas which were held to undermine the Faith, define within certain limits the doctrine of the person of Christ and, by consequence, the doctrine of the Trinity. But, though one of its greatest teachers, Origen, maintained, as we shall see, a view of the purpose of the Scriptures which led him to declare that many statements both of the Old Testament and of the New were in their literal sense untrue, and other views obtained currency which contradicted the idea of the strict infallibility of Scripture, yet the Church never showed any disposition to define the scope of inspiration; and we cannot but feel that a very real movement of the Holy Spirit is apparent in the history of the ancient Church, guiding it in what it did define and in what it abstained from defining.[7] . . .
>
> The contention of these pages has been that we are free to yield to the demands which historic criticism makes on us in its application to the Bible.

---

[6] Page 42.
[7] Page 47.

There is to be found neither in the Bible nor in the records of the Church any authoritative definition of inspiration. If we are now unwilling to say that the Bible *is* the Word of God in the sense that all its phrases, on all sorts of subjects, were dictated by God and are infallible, yet we are no less sure than our ancestors that it contains and conveys to us the Word of God.[8]

The formula which is found in the Westminster Confession of Faith to which Presbyterian ministers subscribe as containing "the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures" is that the Scriptures are "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." On this formula these ministers stand and it does not assert inerrancy but infallibility as "a rule of faith and practice," the faith being "what we are to believe concerning God," and the practice "what duty God requires of man."

Putting all these facts and considerations together, we are assured, with Peter an "eyewitness of his majesty" (II Peter 9:16), that we are not following "cunningly devised fables" in the Bible, but are resting on historic facts and documents that are a solid foundation. The Bible in our judgment comes out of the modern critical process of reconstruction as good a religious book as ever —and far better. We now know that we are not trusting it blindly on the ground of its sacredness, but are putting our faith in it in the full light of our scientific investigation. Anyway, there is no escaping this investigation and these results. The Bible is on trial in our day and the only way to vindicate it is to tell the truth about it. We try to hide it from the light and keep it immune from publicity at its peril. Special pleading and misrepresentation and shouting will not save it. Such methods have lost standing in the scholarly world and are no longer respectable. The worst thing we can do with the Bible is to envelop it in a fog of obscurantism and hope thus to keep it untouched by modern criticism. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light," and this is true of the Bible. Its own bidding and spirit urge us to bring it into the light, and then we see that our modern knowledge and conceptions of the book have not impaired, much less destroyed, it but have brought it nearer to facts and truth and thereby have brought it closer to our

[8] Page 62.

own bosoms and business and made it more real and helpful, more human and also more divine. In the judicious words of Professor W. G. Jordan, "Our claim is that with the larger light thrown upon the history, and the clearer knowledge of the various forms of this literature, we can discern more clearly lines of advancement, and understand more fully the declaration of the great apostle: 'Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual' (1. Cor. 15:46)."[9]

(3) *The Principle of Modernism in the Bible.* Modernism as defined and held by this writer is the principle and spirit of holding and expressing our religious faith and theological doctrines as interpreted in the light of the established knowledge of our day, or the process of progressively unifying our total knowledge and experience, and let no fundamentalist untruthfully impute to him modernism in his own sense of "agnostic modernism" or in any other sense than that which the writer himself has declared and hereby declares that he holds it.

In this proper sense of the word, modernism is not a fixed doctrine or system of doctrine, but by its very nature it changes as it moves forward and keeps abreast of the advancing knowledge of each age. It, therefore, applies to the unifying processes and resulting adjustment and accepted religious faith in each succeeding day and generation. There was a modernism in the nineteenth century which in a measure has been put out of date and left behind by the modernism of the twentieth century. So also there was a modernism in the sixteenth century of the Reformers, and one in the Middle Ages, and one in the first century A. D., and so on back through all the centuries B.C. Moses was a modernist in his day, the Pharisees were fundamentalists, the judaizers in the early Christian church were conservatives, and Peter and Paul were liberals. History repeats itself, the same parties arise, and every age has its own emergent modernism.

The line of study on which we now enter as the distinctive contribution of this book to our subject of old faith and new knowledge is that the Bible was a modernist book in each age through

[9] *History and Revelation*, p. 38.

which it passed and in which it was being formed, and this gives us a valuable key to the interpretation of its various levels and stages of revelation and development. It is not claimed that this principle with its application is entirely original with this book, but it is here brought out into the open to throw fresh light on our study and understanding of the Word of God. The Bible is a continuous illustration of old faith and new knowledge as they grow together and come into progressive adjustment and harmony.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRINCIPLE OF MODERNISM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The most distinctive thing about the Old Testament is that it is old. It has done its work and belongs to the past. It has "waxed old" and is now "done away." It is one of "those things that are shaken, as of things that have been made, that those things which are not shaken may remain." It is like the stratified rocks under our feet that are full of fossils which once were living forms but are now dead and turned to stone.

This is not to disparage the Old Testament, for it was new and useful in its day. And this is just the point we are now about to make. The Old Testament was once the New Testament. In its day it was up to date and was a modernist book. Its old faith advanced with new knowledge and this kept it abreast of the times. When its day had passed it fell behind and was numbered with the things of yesterday; it passed into the museum of fossilized religion and extinct theology. Yet it still remains as a foundation on which we build and as an old root out of which new truth grows and blooms. We shall now follow this line of thought.

1. The Story of Creation

It was one of the epochal discoveries of the nineteenth century in Biblical archeology that there are many Assyrian and Babylonian cosmological and folklore stories that closely correspond with similar records in Genesis. The discovery itself is a tale of romance and adds glory to English exploration and scholarship.[1] The im-

[1] The story is fully told by Sir E. Wallis Budge in *The Rise and Progress of Assyriology*, 1925.

mense value of these discoveries is admitted by scholars of every view and school. "These native records," says a competent authority,[2] "have illuminated and elucidated the early chapters of Genesis. They have established the antiquity of the Hebrew narratives as traditions, with all that this fact involves for interpretation, and they have contributed particulars of greater or less value, which were wanting in the Hebrew record, but which serve to at least cast a side light and sometimes to make methods and conceptions plain which before were obscure or ambiguous."

The problems connected with the relations of the Hebrew Scriptures and the Assyrian and Babylonian tablets have not yet been fully worked out. Some connection is obvious enough, but the time and manner of contact between these literatures is not yet settled. The Hebrews lived in Babylon in the Exile and thus were in direct contact with the life and literature of the Babylonians, but relations between the two peoples or two branches of the same race began long before. Abraham came out of Babylonia with much Babylonian lore in his baggage, probably consisting of the very cuneiform tablets with which we are now familiar. The evidence points to still more ancient common sources and is involved in the larger problem of the Semitic race and its branches. This problem, however, does not enter vitally into the point we have in view and only this reference to it need be made.[3]

All primitive religions have stories of the creation of the universe, and each one is necessarily a child of its age, the outgrowth and expression of the religious and scientific or nature ideas of the people that conceived it. Such ideas, also, were widespread, and affinities and relationships can often be traced among them. The Semitic peoples were especially fertile in such stories, and related versions of creation are found in Greece, Egypt, Persia,

---

[2] Professor John D. Davis, of Princeton Theological Seminary, *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*, p. 3.

[3] A scholarly and up-to-date discussion of the whole problem is *Israel and Babylon* by W. Lansdell Wardle. An older but still useful book is François Lenormant's *The Beginnings of History According to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples.*

India and other quarters, pointing to some more ancient common source.

The Hebrew story of creation found in the first chaper of Genesis has obvious connections with Babylonian mythology and cosmology. The scholars date the document in the Pentateuch in which the first chapter is found, known as P or the Priests' Code, in the Exile in Babylon or a little later. The account in the second chapter belongs to E or the Elohist document which originated earlier in North Israel. The first chapter has close affinities with the Babylonian story.[4] This exists today only in broken tablets which can now be only pieced together in a narrative with many gaps so that it is not easily quotable. It is readily accessible in the commentaries and special authorities.[5] The story is a wild mythological account of an original chaos giving birth to gods which carry on the work of creation in a disorderly manner and engage in deadly mutual combat. It is briefly summarized by Professor Davis, as follows:

> The tale begins with the statement that at first the primeval waters lay mingled together, and eventually became the begetter and bearer of heaven and earth. Deities came into existence: first Lachmu and Lachamu; then, after a considerable period, all above and all below; after lapse of other years, heaven, earth's surface, and terrestrial waters; finally, Marduk, the rising sun. But Timiat, the watery abyss, resisted the unfolding order and infringed the divine command, probably by her continual endeavor to confound earth and heaven and sea. The nightly darkness obscuring the regions of the universe and enveloping all nature in the primeval shroud, the dense mists reuniting at times the waters of heaven and earth, continued rains when the windows of heaven were opened and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, which threatened to deluge the earth and convert the celestial and terrestrial waters into one vast original ocean, suggested a possible return to chaos.[6]

When we compare this with the Hebrew account we are in a different world. The gross polytheism of Babylon has been replaced with the severe monotheism of Genesis and the wild myth-

---

[4] But the relation is not necessarily direct derivation in the Exile, though Genesis may have been influenced by this contact. See Wardle, *Israel and Babylon*, Chapter VI.

[5] Given at length by Jastrow, *Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 428-443.

[6] *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*, p. 13.

ology of the one has been purged and transformed into the orderly process of events in the other. This difference was expressed upwards of fifty years ago by the French scholar François Lenormant as follows:

> It is the same narrative, and in it the same episodes succeed one another in like manner; and yet one would be blind not to perceive that the signification has become altogether different. The exuberant polytheism which encumbers these stories among the Chaldæans has been carefully eliminated, to give place to the severest monotheism. What formerly expressed naturalistic conceptions of singular grossness, here becomes the garb of moral truths of the most exalted and most purely spiritual order. The essential features of the form of the tradition have been preserved, and yet between the Bible and the sacred books of the Chaldæans there is all the distance of one of the most tremendous revolutions which have ever been effected in human beliefs. Herein consists the miracle, and it is none the less amazing for being transposed. Others may seek to explain this by the simple natural progress of the conscience of humanity; for myself, I do not hesitate to find in it the effect of a supernatural intervention of divine Providence, and I bow before the God who inspired the Law and the Prophets.[1]

This statement of the divine origin of the Hebrew narrative we may unreservedly accept; and yet the process by which God effected this change is open to our study. The result was His purpose and providence, but by what means did He bring it about? How did the polytheistic disorderly myth of Babylon become the monotheistic orderly cosmology of Genesis? It was formerly held that the Hebrews received an original inspired revelation of the origin of the world which was the source of all later mythologies, but in the light of our knowledge of the contact of the Jews with the Babylonians and especially in the light of our knowledge that man has been on the earth a far longer time than was formerly supposed, extending to an order of time of fifty or a hundred thousand years, this theory has passed into untenability.

Did not the passage of Hebrew faith and thought from polytheism to monotheism grow out of their progressing knowledge of the orderly course of the world? The Hebrews were themselves in their early history polytheists, but their growing knowledge of the unity of the world as disclosed to them in their observation

[1] *The Beginnings of History*, pp. 16-17.

and experience of it dethroned the polytheistic gods and enthroned their Jehovah as Lord of heaven and earth. They grew into the grand conception, "The earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." It was thus their modern knowledge, modern in their day, that purged and rewrote the Babylonian into the Hebrew cosmology. The first chapter of Genesis in its day was a tremendous piece of modernism. It discarded centuries of ancient thought and put in its place a new conception of the world. We may well suppose that there were conservatives and fundamentalists in that day, certainly among the Babylonians if not among the Jews, who opposed and branded Genesis as "new theology" and "agnostic modernism." But the new was in advance of the old and it has enabled Genesis to hold its place in our Bible to this day.

For the first chapter of Genesis is in many ways the most wonderful chapter in the Bible. It strikes out the universe at a stroke. It compresses the cosmos into a page. It sweeps its circle around the outmost bounds of being and gathers into its totality all atoms and suns and systems. It contains all beginnings and the principles of all progress. It is pregnant with the seeds of all science and philosophy and religion, history and civilization. It is a grand panorama of the process of creation proceeding by majestic steps, a stupendous moving picture or gorgeous pageant of the making of the world. Yet it is marvelously simple and orderly and rational and conforms even to our broad scientific conceptions of natural processes. Evolution is its program and is written broadly across its pages and is woven into the texture of its processes. It stands forever in striking contrast with the confused and chaotic pictures of creation conceived in all other ancient religious attempts to explain the origin of the world. These mythological cosmologies are absurd and irrational and cannot be tolerated by our modern ideas of law and order. The first chapter of Genesis in itself is a striking proof of inspiration. Some guiding Spirit saved the hand that wrote it from the wild vagaries that make other ancient stories of creation impossible to the modern mind and led it along rational lines, and long since have these ancient mythologies been relegated to the oblivion and dust of archeological lore.

It is true that the first chapter of Genesis is not to be forced into literal coincidence with our scientific ideas. It had to be written, to be understandable, in the thought terms of its own day. Its plain purpose is not scientific but religious. "In the beginning God created" is the sublime text of the chapter, the center around which it sweeps its whole circumference. It is teaching, not how the heavens go, but how to go to heaven. When taken on its own ground and in the light of its own purpose it stands to-day unshaken and is acceptable to the modern mind. But the point we are pressing is that, however it may be out of date in our day scientifically, in its own day it was up to date both scientifically and religiously. In our time it may be a piece of fundamentalism; in its own time it was an outstanding and splendid instance of modernism.

This view, it need not be said, does not in any degree impair the presence and inspiration of God in the process of revelation. He uses means in all the acts of His creation and providence and this view only gives us some insight into the way "God made the Bible for us men and our salvation." This method of inspiration will run through all our study of the processes of divine revelation.

2. The Story of the Flood

The story of creation in Genesis is only one of a number of such Semitic traditions in the same book. Davis considers fourteen of them, such as the Sabbath, the Creation of Man, the Garden of Eden, the Temptation of Man, the Serpent of the Temptation, Cain and Abel, the Sons of God, the Tower of Babel, and others. The same general fact is to be observed in the relations of the Babylonian traditions to the similar stories in Genesis as in the case of the creation. The Semitic traditions have been purged of polytheism and mythology and transmuted into the monotheistic order and sobriety of Genesis: that is, the Hebrews modernized them by interpreting them in the light and terms of the nature knowledge and religious faith of their own day.

A second outstanding story may be briefly treated, the story of the flood. This tradition was also widespread over the whole

ancient world, even extending to ancient America. Destructive local floods may have given rise to such stories in many parts of the world. The Babylonian tradition exists in a number of forms that vary considerably in details.[8] The most important one is the Gilgamesh Epic, which is summarized by Skinner and may be further condensed as follows:

> The hero relates how, while he dwelt on the Euphrates, it was resolved by the gods in council to send the Flood on the earth. One of the gods resolved to save the hero, who was one of his favorites, and contrived to send him warning of the impending danger. The hero proceeded to build a ship of definite dimensions, which was divided into compartments and smeared with pitch. The vessel was laden with domestic and wild animals and then the hero embarked with his family and shut the door. On the following morning the storm broke and raged for six days until all mankind were destroyed and the very gods fled and cowered like a dog.

This is told in an extended poem [9] with magnificent imagery and its literary form surpasses the story in Genesis. There are striking points of agreement between the Babylonian and the Hebrew traditions, but the differences are more striking. The Hebrew version has again been stripped of polytheistic and mythological trappings and reclothed in monotheistic and ethical terms and given a spiritual significance. Again we see modernism at work.

Skinner thinks that "the dependence of the biblical narrative on this ancient Babylonian legend hardly requires proof," but that its most important divergences are "its ethical spirit, and its monotheistic conception of God." [10] Wardle concludes that "the very striking coincidences between the Biblical and the Babylonian records of the deluge fall short of demonstrating that the former borrowed from the latter. . . . If, however, we allow that the Biblical story owes some of its material features to Babylonian sources the spirit which informs the narrative is Israel's own. Israel may have inherited, if not from Babylonia, certainly from some other source, a house: but the house has been transformed almost into a temple. To quote the fine words of Jeremias: 'The

---

[8] Wardle gives six versions of it and his chapter on the subject is very complete and illuminating. *Israel and Babylon,* Chapter IX.

[9] Given at length by Jastrow, *Babylonia and Assyria,* pp. 445-452.

[10] *International Critical Commentary, Genesis,* pp. 174-181.

Biblical story of the deluge possesses an intrinsic power, even to the present day, of awakening the world's conscience, and the Biblical chronicler wrote it with this educational and moral end in view. Of this end there is no trace in the extra-Biblical records of the deluge.' '' [11]

And so these old traditions were taken in hand by the Hebrew writers and worked over under divine guidance into modernistic forms according to the light of their day.

3. Abraham the Pioneer of New Faith

Out of the morning mist of Hebrew history emerges the historic personality of Abraham, the pioneer of new faith, the father of the Hebrew race and founder of the Hebrew religion. He came from Ur of Babylonia, the hot-bed of Semitic mythology and polytheism, about the year 2000 B. C. The story begins with his father Terah, who with his family started from Ur for Canaan and got as far as Haran, about halfway to Canaan on the apex of the curve that sweeps far up around to the north to avoid the Syrian desert. Terah went no farther and it does not appear what were the motives that started him on this migration.

At Haran occurred the epochal event that shaped all subsequent history of his people. "Now Jehovah said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will shew thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12:1-3).

Several facts stand out conspicuous in this divine call:

(1) Abraham is commanded to cut loose from country and kindred and his father's house, tearing up all his ancestral patriotic and religious roots, a violent break with his past and a severance of all his social and sacred associations. The old family nest was too foul with polytheistic religion and immorality to breed and nurse in it a new and clean religion.

---

[11] *Israel and Babylon*, pp. 234-35.

(2) He is to go unto a new land as yet unknown to him and there plant his family and begin life over again. A new environment free from the evil associations and temptations of the old was the necessary home of a new religion.

(3) He is to become the father and founder of a great nation and all the families of the earth are to be blessed in him. The star of a world religion here first rises above the horizon.

(4) These commands and promises are made to him by Jehovah speaking as the one true and living God and God of the whole earth. Monotheism here becomes dominant.

(5) Abraham's going out on the basis of this divine call was a great adventure in unquestioning faith and obedience. "By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not knowing whither he went" (Hebrews 11:8).

Considering how deeply Abraham's roots were buried in the soil of polytheism and how his whole ancestral religion had been the worship of many gods, this was a total disruption of his life and a tremendous transition to a new faith and land and life. He turned his back upon the East and set his face towards the newer West. When we consider how terribly difficult and agonizing is the process of changing our religious faith and how great are the dangers and hardships of emigration out of an old country into a new, this break and step of Abraham's was an act of sublime faith and heroism. Perhaps the transition was not as sudden and violent as it seems to us and may have been preceded by preparatory stages and gradual steps, and yet his new faith stands out suddenly against the sky of the polytheistic East in wide and bold contrast with the old, and he was truly the pioneer of a new religion. This religion was monotheism, the worship of the one true and sovereign God, and this great act of faith and forward step into a new life was the historic beginning of that faith that grew through Hebrew history and culminated in the Christian faith in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Far East has dreamed great religions, but it has never laid universal and solid foundations for a world religion. Abraham dreamed this dream and laid this foundation. "In thee shall all

the families of the earth be blessed'' was an idea and revelation that came first to him.

If we think that such a break with the past and movement forward into a new religion was too wide a step for any one man to take, we should remember that great epochs are often precipitated by great personalities. A legend is usually the lengthened shadow of an upstanding person. ''Its essence consists of an idea of a wonderful personality who has made a deep impression on human life—who excited admiration, furnished an example, and opened new paths.'' [12] We need only think of Plato and Kant, Cæsar and Napoleon, Copernicus and Columbus, Newton and Darwin, Luther and Lincoln to see how history has been shaped and the centuries thrown into new channels by such personalities. Abraham was such an epochal prophet who started humanity on a new road that day ''he went out, not knowing whither he went.''

We are not to suppose, however, that Abraham achieved a wholly clear concept of and a full and final faith in Jehovah as the one true God. Such epochal ideas and forward movements are usually attended with faltering steps and backward slips. In fact we presently find ''teraphim'' or family gods in the tent of Laban, Abraham's nephew, which Rachel stole when she ran off with Jacob and was smart enough to hide in her tent and to conceal from her father's search by sitting on them (Gen. 31:19, 33-34). We know such gods long lingered among the Hebrews and it was many generations before they were purged of all remnants of idolatry (11 Kings 23:34; Hosea 3:4). The clay of their ancient polytheism long clung to the roots of their newer monotheism. Yet to Abraham belongs the imperishable glory of being the first to catch the vision of the one true and sovereign God and to follow the gleam of this star, though his steps led him through shadows and twilight in which he and his descendants at times saw only dimly.

The ethical and spiritual idea of God which is at the foundation of the religion of Israel could only enter the world through a personal organ of divine revelation; and nothing forbids us to see in Abraham the first of that long series of prophets through whom God has communicated to mankind a saving knowledge of himself. The keynote of Abraham's piety is *faith* in the unseen,—faith in the divine impulse which drove him forth to

[12] Höffding, *The Philosophy of Religion*, p. 200.

a land which he was to possess; and faith in the future of the religion which he thus founded. He moves before us on the page of Scripture as the man through whom faith, the living principle of true religion, first became a force in human affairs. It is difficult to think that so powerful a conception has grown out of nothing. As we read the story, we may well trust the instinct which tells us that here we are face to face with a decisive act of the living God in history, and an act whose essential significance was never lost in Israelite tradition.[13]

We need not follow Abraham farther, but the lesson of his life is plain. He was a pioneer in his day of a new religion, he brought his creed up abreast with his conscience, he followed the new light that dawned upon him, he modernized his old faith into the new, and, therefore, he was a modernist in his day and an example for us in our day.

4. Moses the Modernist

Moses easily looms up as the tallest figure in the Old Testament and as he stands on Mt. Sinai he casts his mighty shadow down on our modern world and is still shaping our civilization. The question of how much of the Pentateuch goes back to him is relatively unimportant for our purpose as he is the unquestioned fountain from which flows the legislation found in it. A single authority on this point may be quoted: We are warranted "in believing that many of the laws and institutions of the Pentateuch originated with Moses, or received his sanction, or are the natural application to later times of the principles involved in his government of Israel."[14] Two points in this connection may be noted.

(1) *The Decalogue.* The Decalogue is the foundation and framework of Hebrew and Christian theology and ethics. It is laid deep in the constitution of human nature and character and society and is a summary of the necessary laws of life in keeping of which there is great reward and in violation of which there is sure degeneration and death.

The question of the origin of these Ten Commandments arises and is attended with great interest. We may assume at once that they did not originate in principle with Moses, for the world was

[13] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 27.

[14] W. H. Bennett in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III, p. 446.

then old and could not have survived without them. Any human society that did not know and keep these elementary laws of life would perish of its own wickedness. Laws against murder and adultery and theft had been in the world from the earliest times, and ages of human experience had confirmed them as necessary conditions of life. The metal of these commandments had been in use in a crude state as a means of social barter: Moses under divine inspiration minted them into current coin and put them into general and permanent circulation. The sharp die and authoritative form may be his, but their substance is the raw material of universal human experience.

Detailed evidence of this obvious fact may be gathered from any page of the past. "The wrong of murder," says Badé, "theft, false witness, and adultery required no special revelation . . . and attended the earliest manifestations of the moral instinct even in the man of the stone age."[15] Paul says the same thing: "For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them" (Rom. 2:14-15).

Archeology now comes to our aid and throws its light upon this point. The Hebrews had two main ancestral and environmental roots: the more ancient ancestral root in Babylon and the more recent environmental root in Egypt. As they had but recently come out of Egypt when the Decalogue was framed, we first look there for any traces of its origin.

The Hebrews were enslaved in Egypt and submerged in its civilization for several centuries and must have absorbed much of its life and acquired some of its lore, and yet there is surprising little Egyptian coloring in the Pentateuch. The Egyptian *Book of the Dead* was an elaborate ritual pertaining to death and judgment and contained many directions and requirements that would prepare the dead for entering the hall of judgment and passing the scrutiny of Osiris. A long list of denials the dead must make are

---

[15] *The Old Testament in the Light of To-day*, pp. 88-89.

given, such as "I have not killed," "I have not committed adultery," "I have not stolen," and so on. These Egyptian requirements are much more ancient than the Mosaic commandments and the similarity of the latter to the former is obvious. Yet it is not claimed that Moses directly derived his Decalogue from this Egyptian book, but such requirements must have been known to him in his Egyptian life and may have suggested to him some of his commandments.

In Babylonia similar requirements are "found in the exorcism series known as *Shurpu.*" A sufferer believing that his troubles are due to some evil spirit applies to the priest who performs the ritual of incantation and inquires, "Has he entered his neighbor's house? Has he approached his neighbor's wife? Has he shed his neighbor's blood? Has he stolen his neighbor's garment?" "The close likeness," says Wardle, "of these last questions to the corresponding commandments of the Decalogue is very striking." Wardle concludes his examination of these Egyptian and Babylonian parallels as follows:

> These examples from Egypt and Babylonia do, however, make it easier to accept the position that the Decalogue may well go back to Moses, who would have been doing nothing unprecedented in making a formal list of ethical and cultus regulations. We cannot forget, though, that both the Egyptian and the Babylonian parallels are, as they have reached us, embedded in a grossly material magical setting, a fact which makes it clear that they were employed not because of their ethical value so much as on account of their supposed magical potency.[16]

A special case is the question whether the Babylonians had a seventh day of rest corresponding with the Hebrew Sabbath. "It is not impossible," says Driver, "that ultimately the institution was of Babylonian origin: in Babylonian there occurs (though rarely) the word *shabbatum,* meaning the day for propitiating a deity's anger, and in Babylonia also, especially in the earlier periods of the history, every seventh day of the month was marked by abstention from secular business: but even if that was the case (for connecting links are still wanting), it is certain that when adopted by the Hebrews, a new character was impressed upon it by

[16] *Israel and Babylon,* p. 301.

the higher and purer religion of Israel."[17] This is bearing out the general principle here being presented that at each stage of Hebrew revelation old pagan faith was brought up to date and modernized in accordance with new religious knowledge and life.

(2) *Mosaic Legislation.* The Decalogue found in Exodus Chapter XX is followed in Chapters XXI-XXII with civil laws regulating Hebrew life. The same fact is repeated in Deuteronomy where the shorter version of the Decalogue in Chapter V is followed in later chapters with many civil laws. Are there any parallels to this Mosaic legislation in Babylonian law? An epochal discovery was made in 1902 at Susa, in Persia, of a black diorite stela or column eight feet high inscribed with the laws of Hammurabi who reigned in Babylon about 2150 B. C., more than a hundred years before Abraham emigrated from that country to Canaan. This is the oldest known code of laws in the world. The text of these laws extends to 8000 words and they have been translated and compared with similar laws in the Mosaic legislation.[18] They reveal a stage of civilization in justice and humanity little lower than our own. "What impresses us most of all," says Wardle, "is that in essentials the civilization of today has not advanced from the conditions portrayed here nearly as much as we flatter ourselves. Evidently the Babylonians of four thousand years ago were on the whole a law-abiding people, and veracity was highly esteemed among them."

The question of the relation of the codes of Hammurabi and the Mosaic legislation is answered in a similar way to that which applies to the Decalogue. There was no direct derivation of the Mosaic legislation from the Babylonian code, which was a thousand years older, and yet they were both Semitic and must have had more ancient common roots. The case is summed up by Barton as follows:

A comparison of the code of Hammurabi as a whole with the Pentateuchal laws as a whole, while it reveals certain similarities, convinces the student

[17] *The Cambridge Bible, Exodus,* p. 198. For a somewhat different view see Wardle, *Israel and Babylon,* Chapter X.

[18] They will be found translated and arranged in groups in Barton's *Archæology and the Bible,* Chapter XIII. See also Wardle, *Israel and Babylon,* Chapter XI, and Jastrow, *Babylonia and Assyria,* Chapter VI.

that the laws of the Old Testament are in no essential way dependent upon the Babylonian laws. Such resemblances as there are arose, it seems clear, from a similarity of antecedents and of general intellectual outlook; the striking differences show that there was no direct borrowing. . . . The code of Hammurabi is adapted to the land of rivers, and to a highly civilized commercial people, while the Biblical laws are intended for a dry land like Palestine, and for an agricultural community that was at a far less advanced stage of commercial and social development. Religion is, however, not a matter of social advancement only. In all that pertains to religious insight the Pentateuch is far in advance of Hammurabi's laws.

Our conclusion at this point is that the Mosaic Decalogue and legislation at each stage in their advance were brought up to date and interpreted and expressed in the larger knowledge and clearer revelation of their day. In the true and proper sense of the term Moses was a modernist.

5. The Progressive Hebrew Conception of God

The concept of God is the fundamental fact of religion. No God means no religion, and any religion will expand or contract, be elevated or degraded, to fit its idea of God. As all human ideas are in some degree relative to the minds that think them, there are as many gods as there are religious minds. However, this fact is not fatal to religion, as there are great group concepts of God, each corresponding with its own religion.

The concept of God is also subject to degree and growth, advancing from stage to stage as worshipers enlarge their knowledge and deepen their religious experience. All sources and kinds of knowledge and experience pour their tributary streams into this sea so that our God, so to speak, grows with all our growth. This does not mean, of course, that God really grows, though some hold this view, but that our apprehension of Him continually changes and advances, as does our knowledge of the sun.[19]

God is thus apprehended by us at different levels of intellectual and moral and spiritual conception and experience. Our idea of God, while fundamentally the same, is yet enormously different from that of our Christian forebears of the Middle Ages, or of the first century A. D., or of the fifth or tenth century B. C. We have

[19] See *The Idea of God,* by Charles A. Beckwith.

moved into wider horizons and a vaster world infinitely richer in knowledge of nature and of human nature, with clearer visions and loftier aspirations, and all this has affected, expanded and enriched our idea of God. This is the principle of modernism as applied to our doctrine of God. This doctrine ought not to and cannot stand still, fixed and finished, static and stagnant, but should ever move up abreast with all our knowledge, and thus new knowledge is ever enlightening and enlarging old faith.

This process runs through the whole Bible and especially is it evident in the Old Testament. We may note this progress with reference to two points, the sovereignty and the character of God.

(1) *The Sovereignty of God.* The Hebrews started with low views of the nature of God. They came out of polytheism and these old pagan conceptions long clung as remnants and rags to their own God. Idols were stolen by Rachel and concealed in her tent, and time and again the Israelites relapsed into gross idolatry. At first Jehovah was their tribal God and they did not deny the existence and the power of the pagan gods of the tribes around them. Even the Second Commandment did not deny the existence of these gods but only demanded that they be kept out of the presence of Jehovah. The tribal God was thought of as traveling around with the wandering tribe, but also as having some particular abode, and Sinai was viewed as the special seat and habitat of Jehovah.

When Israel became settled in Canaan their idea of God expanded to a territorial God with Palestine as His domain outside of which He did not reign and could not be worshiped. Naaman the Syrian asked Elisha for two loads of the soil of Palestine, thinking that, as this would be a portion of Jehovah's land, worship upon it would be acceptable to Him wherever it might be transported (II Kings 5:17). In time Jehovah's region was extended to heaven and then at length to all the earth. Thus the Hebrews had at last reached the summit of faith and vision where they could see and say, "The earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1). But this was a long and gradual achievement. The distance from polytheism to monotheism was too wide to be taken at one stride, but called for many successive steps. The Hebrews extended the sovereignty

of the One True God as their knowledge of the world widened and their religious vision was clarified, keeping their faith up with their experience, and this is the principle of modernism.

(2) *The Character of God.* In a similar way the Hebrew conception of the character of God grew through the centuries of growing knowledge and experience. At first it was strongly and sometimes grossly anthropomorphic. God was viewed as having a literal body with fleshly organs and senses. He was hungry for food and delighted in fat and in the smell of burnt meat (Lev. 3). Jehovah also was viewed as having human virtues of strength and bravery and faithfulness to His friends and with human passions of vindictiveness and hate, sparing none of His enemies but slaying "both man and woman, infant and suckling" (I Sam. 15:3). These were common views of their gods held by all the neighboring pagan tribes and the Hebrews shared in them.

But in later years the Hebrews attained to views of God spiritually and ethically purer and higher. The great prophets finally arrived at visions of a purely spiritual Jehovah who delighted not in sacrifice and bloody offering and burnt meat but loathed such worship (Amos 5:21-24), and abounded in justice and righteousness, compassion and love.

Jehovah thus starts out as the tribal God of the Hebrews clothed upon with clouds of human limitation and imperfection and with the dark shadows of human passion, but as He strides onward through expanding Hebrew faith and knowledge these human imperfections fall off and He finally stands forth in all the majesty and glory and beauty of the one sovereign and spiritual and holy and good God in whom we clearly discern the lineaments of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a long distance from the God of Sinai and the wilderness and the times of the Judges to the God of Amos and Isaiah and the Exile. Broader knowledge and clearer revelation and richer spiritual experience took the steps that lay between these stages and brought the old faith to the new vision. The principle of modernism was again exemplified.[20]

---

[20] An illuminating book on this subject is *God in the Old Testament*, by Robert A. Aytoun.

6. A Progressive Scale of Moral and Spiritual Values

There is a progressive scale of moral and spiritual values in the Old Testament which has been illustrated in the instances already given but which is worthy of special mention.

Value is our sense of worth or the satisfying power possessed by an object, and it is especially applicable to and fruitful in the field of religion. We have a scale of values beginning with the lowest and rising to the highest. The material is at the bottom as chronologically it comes first in necessity, for the material is the necessary basis of the spiritual. And so we find Hebrew religion, like all pagan religions, in its early stages to be largely materialistic in its ideas of God and of human values. God is of human form and nature and is to be served for pay and He rewards His faithful worshipers with the finest wheat and sweetest honey and pays the highest cash wages. In time these material ideas are transmuted into a spiritual God and spiritual rewards. Human values start on a low ethical level with polygamy and slavery, and slowly advance through a rising sense of the essential worth of every soul into monogamy and liberty. Despotism becomes liberalized into democracy. The law of retaliation and all the savagery of early civilization are modified and mollified into more humane methods of justice. The religion of bloody sacrifices is replaced with the true offering to God of a broken and a contrite heart. Early religion is largely outward and later religion becomes increasingly inward. Outer rites and ceremonies are transmuted into inner spirit and disposition. Early religion grips the tribe with an iron hand, but later religion pervades the whole social order with its spirit and transforms it with higher ideals. Early religion exacts justice and revenge of the tribal enemy, but later religion administers justice within the tribe and nation and is especially watchful and merciful towards the poor and oppressed and unsparing in dealing with the extortionate rich and proud. Early religion is largely concerned with the interests of its own tribe and has no interest beyond its borders; later religion attains to a world vision and develops a sense of world responsibility. Early religion is local, and later religion is universal.

There is thus an ascending scale of values in the ethical and

religious world rising from the lowest physical to the highest spiritual worths. Only the lower parts of this scale are at first clearly visible and the upper portions are obscured with clouds and darkness. But the light keeps moving up the scale successively disclosing higher and higher portions until men begin to be aware of the loftiest and purest spiritual values where the scale merges into and coincides with the character of God, the ultimate and eternal standard of value.

What causes the light to move up the scale? Why does the New Testament have a higher and finer scale of value than the Old? And why do we now have a scale of values cleared of many shadows that obscured it to the eyes of our fathers? The first answer is that God is ever pouring more light on the scale through the indwelling and operation of His Spirit in the world and opening the eyes of men so that they see more clearly. But God ever works through human means, and a further answer is that the thoughts of men are widening as through the ages one increasing purpose runs. Or stated in the terms of our principle, enlarging knowledge and experience are ever enlightening the old faith and moving it higher up the scale and thereby bringing it up to date. Another name for this principle is modernism.

At many points and in many ways we find religion in the Old Testament passing through stages to higher levels where old things were cast away and new things were adopted. The material form was superseded by the spiritual content and the outward passed into the inward.

Several striking illustrations of this may be given. The brazen serpent Moses set up in the plague-stricken camp in the wilderness was a means of faith and healing to the Israelites in that day, but later this same brass serpent was preserved as an object of reverence that grew into idolatrous worship. It was once a useful form and had outlived its usefulness and become a menace. Then, five hundred years later, what did Hezekiah in his great reformation do? "He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah: and he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense unto it; and he called it Nehushtan" (II Kings 18:4). "Nehushtan" he dared to call it, "a piece of brass," with no more

virtue than any other piece of brass, and he smashed it to pieces. What had been good as a helpful form in the day of Moses had become a harmful idol in the day of Hezekiah and he made way with it by reducing it to its true worth as a heap of broken brass.

A similar instance is found in the case of the ark. In Joshua 7:6 we read: "And Joshua rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face before the ark of Jehovah until the evening," and then he prayed unto Jehovah. That wooden box was a necessary means of symbolizing and sustaining his faith. It was as though he thought that God were in that box and to lose the box would be to lose his God. Again turning the leaves of history, about six hundred years later what do we find the spiritual prophet Jeremiah saying? "And it shall come to pass, when ye are multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith Jehovah, they shall no more say, The ark of the covenant of Jehovah; neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they miss it; neither shall it be made any more" (Jer. 3:16). Jeremiah had passed beyond the need of the ark and did not want it to be missed or remembered. His God was no longer confined within the walls of a box or even symbolized by it, but had become a God who was to be worshiped in spirit and in truth.

Jesus did the same thing when with one wave of his hand he swept the temple off Mount Zion as an exclusive place of worship and let worship out as a free and universal spiritual act and privilege. In all these instances these advanced prophets did away with the old and outworn and substituted for them the new and spiritual in accordance with their advance in spiritual light and truth; and this was the spirit and process of modernism.

7. The Vision of the Prophets

The prophetic period rose far beyond the law in ethical teaching. Jeremiah caught a glimpse of the great truth presented in the Sermon on the Mount; namely, religion is a state of soul rather than an outward observance. In this foregleam he declared, "I will put my law in their inward parts; and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (31:33). Micah placed the emphasis upon positive morality: "What doth

Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God" (6:8). Isaiah shifted the center of moral gravity from "vain oblations" to personal purity. "Wash you, make you clean" (1:13-17). Habakkuk gave Paul the key to his doctrine of justification and laid the foundation for Luther's Reformation—"the righteous shall live by his faith" (Hab. 2. Cf. Rom. 1:17, Gal. 3:2). They went beyond the morality of personal purity and emphasized the ethics of social relations. Isaiah condemned the ownership of the land by a few to the injury of society. "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land" (5:8). The prophets thunder against those "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall" (Amos 6:4), and "oppress the hireling in his wages" (Malachi 3:5).

The prophets were far ahead of the ethical living of their day and were ever striving to lift it to a higher level. They were tremendous preachers of social righteousness. They dared to stand with the poor and oppressed against the injustice of the rich and powerful classes. They spiritualized the decadent ceremonial religion of Judaism and gave it new vision and spirit. Especially did they rise above the narrow nationalism of the Jews and swept their vision over neighboring nations and over the whole world in sympathy and hope. They saw the dawn of the universal kingdom of God brightening the eastern horizon with the promise of a new day. They foresaw the rising of the Star of the Prince of Peace who would rule the world in righteousness. Our democracy has not yet caught sight of their political ideals, our social order lags far behind their social gospel, our League of Nations and dreams of world peace are but the blades and buds of seeds they planted, and our utmost achievements grow pale and pitiful in the light of their splendid visions. They were forward-looking men, ever moving away from the past, dissatisfied with the present and were driven under a divine urge towards a better future; and this is the spirit of modernism.

We have thus gone through the Old Testament and applied our principle to it at a few prominent points and found that it answers

to and fulfils it. At every advancing stage the Old Testament in its day was a New Testament. It brought the old faith of paganism, which it had inherited, forward into its own larger knowledge and clearer divine revelation and thus revised it and brought it up to date. It did not stand still and stagnant and persistent in rigid conservatism, but kept itself plastic and progressive. The old was never satisfied to remain old but ever felt an urge towards the new. The Old Testament was ever a forward-looking book. It faced the east and not the west, the rising and not the setting sun. It was not in its day an obscurantist book opposing new knowledge, but it welcomed new light and truth. When it had reached the limit of its growth and its work was done, it was willing to drop as a seed into the soil of the centuries that it might bring forth a New Testament. The Old was glorious, but it had a prophetic presentiment that the New would be more glorious. The Old Testament in its day was a tremendous and splendid piece of modernism.

CHAPTER VII

THE PRINCIPLE OF MODERNISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: I. IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

The distinctive characteristic of the New Testament is that it is new. It is separated from the Old by a chasm of centuries and it lives and moves and has its being in a new world. Old things have passed away in its pages and all things have become new. The political map has undergone radical changes. The ancient empires of Babylon and Egypt are gone, and Greece and Rome have come. Rome has swept its sword around the Mediterranean and turned it into a Roman lake. The Western world has been shaped into a grand arena in which the drama of history is staged with spectacular pomp. Populous cities have sprung up at new centers embellished with all the glories of architecture and art. All roads ran to Rome and the imperial city in its power and pride rifled the world of its treasures to fill its coffers with unearned wealth and clothe itself in splendor and live in luxury and unbridled license. Palestine has shrunk to an obscure corner and province of the Empire, and the Jew, so proud-spirited and rebellious with all the golden memories of the spacious days of Solomon burning unquenchably in his breast, lay crushed and writhing under the hated iron heel of Cæsar. Old pagan religions were dying and passing into ghosts. Yet never was the human heart more hungry for religion and on that hard pagan world disgust and secret loathing fell and it dreamed a dream and cherished a strange presentiment of a coming Saviour.

And Rome had prepared the world in ways it knew not for his coming. It had built roads and bridges and swept the sea of pirates and thus made travel safe and communication rapid. It had suppressed war and hushed the vast arena of its world into peace so that the coming Prophet could be heard. It had unwit-

tingly brought to pass the fulness of time and made all things ready for his appearing.

In this new world the New Testament was born. It is the child of its age and compacts into its pages all the elements of its time. The Roman Empire with its far-flung, world-encompassing frontiers, its many lands and languages, its seas and cities, its theaters and arenas, its peasant villages and its city mobs, its government and politics, its slaves and its philosophers, its gods and religions, is crowded into its compass. It paints its pictures and portraits and delineates its doctrines with the pigments of contemporary life and thought. It is the Old Testament brought up to date and adapted to its day. In its time it was a modernist book.

1. Relation of the New Testament to the Old

The New Testament is the child of the Old and acknowledges this parentage at every point. The new should never disparage the old, and this is a point that modernism should ever keep in mind. However far the new may have moved away from the old, yet its indebtedness to the old is immense and it should ever be held in reverence. Let not the oak despise the acorn out of which it grew, or the nightingale disdain the egg out of which it came, for all its colored plumage and sweet music lay tucked up and sleeping in that plain shell. Any modernism that disparages and is impertinent towards the past is blind and impertinent in itself.

The New Testament roots itself back in the Old at every point; all its fibers and rootlets run down into the Old and draw nourishment from its soil. The New Testament derives from the Old all its essential doctrines of God and man, sin and salvation as seeds which it then expands into flower and fruit. The New is thus concealed in the Old, and the Old is revealed in the New. It is no more possible to understand the New Testament apart from the Old than it is to understand the second volume of a two-volume work apart from the first. The fundamental connection between the Old Testament and the New is that the sacrifices of the Old prefigure the supreme sacrifice of the cross, and the Messiah of the Old is the Christ of the New.

There are two hundred and seventy-five quotations from the Old

Testament in the New, which are so many visible threads binding the two books together, or roots running out of the one into the other, besides the innumerable filaments of allusion that interlace them. The Gospel of Mark, the earliest written gospel, opens with a quotation from the Old Testament, so that the new gospel connects itself with the Old Testament in its very first sentence. If we were to strike out of the New Testament all the quotations and allusions and doctrines drawn from the Old Testament, the New would be riddled to pieces and rendered unintelligible. These two volumes of the Word of God are indissolubly united, one principle pervades them, one heart beats in them and one spiritual blood courses through them. They have been divinely combined into one volume in the history of redemption and what God hath joined together let not man put asunder.

And yet the New Testament is not just a repetition of the Old; it is new and startlingly so. The New is the Old brought up to date and modernized. All its doctrines and ordinances are recast into the forms of the advanced revelation and knowledge and experience of its day. The New at one stride steps out of the Old across the centuries into its own age, and it speaks to its own audience in its own language and thought terms.

The most striking change in the New is that it has exchanged its old Hebrew clothes for the latest fashion in language. The obsolete Hebrew has been displaced by the current Greek. The immortal glory of proclaiming the new gospel in their own speech has been lost to the Jews and given to pagan Greeks. The sacred ancestral language of their fathers has been abandoned for a modern tongue. The old language was local and provincial and would soon pass into disuse and unintelligibility, but the new was a universal language that could travel and be understood everywhere. The old was only a crutch that only a few could use within a limited area, but the new gave wings to the gospel to fly to the ends of the known world. The Greek Testament was in itself a long stride forward to keep up with a moving world, a tremendous piece of modernism.

The same is true of our English Bible to-day. We have practically abandoned the inspired Hebrew and Greek in which holy men spake and wrote as they were moved of the Holy Spirit and

have dared to express their inspired revelations in our own English, and we have recently revised and modernized this English version still further. Those who are shy and take alarm at such a phrase as "new theology" should pause and consider the significance of the name *New Testament.*

From this general view of the relation of the New Testament to the Old we see that the New in its day was a modernist book, and this will still further appear as we proceed.

2. The Principle of Modernism in the Teaching of Jesus

Let us not be alarmed at the application of the principle of modernism to the teaching of Jesus, keeping in mind the true meaning of the word as the continual unification of progressive knowledge and experience. Will any one say that Jesus was obsolete or out of date in his teaching in his day? Obviously not. He was always up to date and ahead of his age and illustrates the principle of modernism at many points.

(1) *The Attitude of Jesus towards the Old Testament.* Jesus used and revered the Old Testament. He was brought up on it in the home, it was his text-book in the village school, and it was used in the worship in the synagogue at Nazareth. It was by feeding on this book that he "advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." He was familiar with the stirring scenes of its history, its stories of national heroes, its dramatic events, triumphs and tragedies, its poetry and prophecy. He sang its psalms and had his imagination kindled with the sublime visions of Isaiah and the grand drama of Job. He sunk all his roots into it and absorbed its teaching and spirit into his soul.

In his preaching he constantly used it, quoting his first text from it, drawing his illustrations from its storehouse, coloring his speech with it, not hesitating to apply its prophecies to himself and saying to his hearers, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me."

Yet, on the other hand, Jesus revised the Old Testament and brought it up to date. He recast all its teachings in his own forms of thought and molded it to his own purpose. Much of it did not

suit him at all and he sloughed off these obsolete and incongruous materials and selected what fit in with his own teaching.

Deeper and more radical still, he did not hesitate to cut into its text and teaching and criticize it. He boldly corrected Moses. Six times he does this in the Sermon on the Mount, quoting the Mosaic legislation and then saying, "But I say unto you" something different, sometimes deepening and spiritualizing the old law and sometimes flatly contradicting it (Matt. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44). Christ contradicts Moses! There it stands plainly written in the record. The old was too narrow for him, and he broadened it; it was too external, and he turned it inward; or it belonged to a lower ethical stage, and he lifted it to a higher level. Thus Jesus put himself above the Scriptures and made them subservient to himself. As he was lord of the Sabbath, so was he also lord of the Scriptures. He revised and corrected them and brought them up to the level of his own light and leading. He modernized the Old Testament into the New and in this sense he was a modernist.

(2) *The Conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees.* The Pharisees were the fundamentalists of their day. We use the term in no opprobrious sense, but in the sense that they were rigid conservatives and held strictly to the past. The old was good enough for them. They had crystallized their creed into fixity and finality. They left no capacity and room in it for elasticity and growth and liberty. They also literalized the Scriptures and insisted on the very letter of its language. This led them to a doctrine of inerrancy that was carried to its logical extreme. They counted the very words of the Old Testament and knew the middle word! Yet they had an ingenious art of overlaying the commandments with commentaries of their own and these "traditions" were spun out and elaborated into an astounding system of complexity and triviality which encased all life in a strait-jacket in which one could hardly move or breathe. These were "the traditions of the elders" with which the scribes made "the word of God of none effect," "heavy burdens and grievous to be borne," which they laid "on men's shoulders, but they themselves" would "not move them with one of their fingers," for they resorted to all sorts of cunning and hypocritical subterfuge to evade them. Finally, they insisted on the inspiration and inerrancy and divine authority of these human

additions far exceeding that of the law of Moses. "It is a greater offense," said the Mishna, the Jewish book containing these additional laws, "to teach anything contrary to the voice of the rabbis, than to contradict Scripture itself." "The Bible was like water, the Traditions like wine, the Commentaries on them like spiced wine."

These Pharisees had now reached the ultimate extreme of their fundamentalism in which they identified themselves with final truth. Their *ipse dixit* was the last word that could be said on any subject and to doubt them was to doubt God. They confused their own doctrines with divine deliverances and to differ from them enraged them and consigned their opponents to outer darkness. They lacked a sense of humor which would have saved them from such absurdity by giving them a proper sense of proportion and the relative values of things. With them the smallest petty point, especially one of their own devising, was as big and important as the broadest divine commandment that undergirds the very universe. They took themselves too seriously and saw themselves in a magnifying mirror that flattered them but made them look ridiculous to others.

Jesus encountered these Pharisees and engaged with them in dialectical combats that are among the most interesting incidents in his ministry. They were amazed that he, a despised Nazarene, should dare to differ from them and stand up against them. This was insufferable presumption and they would take a fall out of him. He delighted to play with them and keep them puzzled and mystified and wondering what he would do next. His keen rapier was too swift and sharp for their antiquated bludgeons. They were like Goliath in his heavy brass armor meeting David with his stone in a sling. Time and again he caught them in their own net, hoisted them with their own petard. He convicted them out of their own mouths, punctured their solemn pomposity, exposed their shallow conceit and made them a laughingstock before their own followers. It was generally a sorry day with them when they met him.

Jesus soon found himself entangled in this fundamentalism of the Pharisees and then in deadly antagonism with it. They tried to fasten their fundamentalism on him and quickly grew suspicious

of him as they discovered to their dismay that he would not conform to it. He soon broke with them and trampled on their traditions and boldly smashed their whole system. Against their conservatism he opposed his liberalism and against their fundamentalism he put his modernism. On the principle of liberty he staked his life.

It was also a fundamental doctrine of the Pharisees that the Messiah was to come as a conqueror to break the yoke of Roman despotism and set up a worldly kingdom with Jerusalem as its capital and themselves in the chief offices. Their Messiah was to be a militarist and their kingdom was to be materialistic. Jesus also came into violent conflict with this idea of the Messiah and of the kingdom. He refused to seize a sword and to be made a king by force, but on the contrary he paid taxes to the Roman government and obeyed the laws of Cæsar. His kingdom, he declared, is not of this world but is a spiritual reign within the hearts of men. All this enraged the Pharisees and was the real cause of their crucifying Jesus. They fell upon him in fury and crushed him on a cross.

In all this Jesus was trampling upon the literalism and traditionalism, conservatism and fundamentalism, externalism and materialism, of the scribes and Pharisees and asserting liberty and life, the spirit against the letter, the inwardness and spirituality of the kingdom against an outward worldly rule, a forward against a backward look and life. He was keeping pace with the growing light of revelation, and this is the principle of modernism.

(3) *The Teaching of Jesus.* In his teaching Jesus spiritualized the Old Testament at a stroke. With one magnificent utterance and gesture he swept off the mountain top of Zion the Temple with all its Old Testament ordinances and pageantry. He released the worship of the Father from a local habitation and cult into the freedom of the spirit and let it out into universality; no matter about the place and time.

His preaching was of this free and spiritual kind that could just as well be preached on a mountainside or a seashore as in a village synagogue or a splendid temple. The Pharisees and scribes were droning away about abstract doctrines and empty ordinances that had lost all human interest and meaning. Across this dry and barren waste of fossilized theology and theological hair-splitting

came the human, fresh and vital preaching of Jesus like a cooling breeze and a shower of rain. At once the people noticed the difference and began to hear him gladly and to say that he preached with authority and not as the scribes. They were delighted with his skill in unhorsing the pompous Pharisees and humbling them to the dust. His preaching was as simple and understandable, as human and useful as farming and fishing. He spoke to the people in their own speech and talked in the thought-terms of his time. On one occasion they all went home from his preaching saying, "We have seen strange things to-day." On another occasion the people exclaimed, "What is this? A new teaching!" Jesus a teacher of new theology! This surely was modernism. He did not keep to the old paths of the scribes and Pharisees, the doctors of divinity and professors of theology of his day, but he boldly struck out into new paths. He revised and rewrote the religious creeds of his day and kept going the process of ever bringing religion up to date abreast of all revelation and knowledge and experience. Does not this deliver us from the bondage of the theory that theology must ever be old and forever keep on saying the same things in the same words and never say a new thing? What was this but modernism in the preaching of Jesus? We know not what else to call it. This is the very thing that we mean and that is rightly meant by this term.

There are a number of specific teachings of Jesus that expressly or implicitly set forth the principle of modernism.

The first recorded command in the preaching of Jesus was "Repent ye" (Mark 1:15), a word that means "Change your mind." Change your mind! This is the cry that rings through the New Testament from beginning to end; and it is to this day the initial word and call of the gospel. At the opening of the Universal Conference on Christian Life and Work at Stockholm in August, 1925, the Lord Bishop of Winchester preached a notable sermon on this text and began with these striking words: "Change your mind. Adopt a new outlook. Get a fresh point of view. That was Christ's challenge to his own generation. That is the challenge which in his name we make to-day to the men and women of these modern days." Thus the first imperative word in the preaching of Jesus expressed or at least implied the principle of modernism.

The parables and passages in which the gospel is likened to seed sown in the ground imply growth and progress, which is the principle we are illustrating. The seed absorbs out of the soil and shower and sunshine the elements that enter into its growth and blossom and fruit. As the soil and climate are changed, so in some degree does the fruit change also. The size and texture and flavor of the fruit vary with the habitat and may vary widely when the seed is transplanted to a different country or continent. The plant is also subject to cultivation and may be greatly improved in a more congenial environment. In fact, all our cultivated grains and fruits were wild-growing plants which have thus been improved.

The analogy of the gospel to seed implies that it will be subject to like changes. This fact is abundantly illustrated in the history of Christianity, which has always in some degree adapted itself to the soil in which it has been planted. When its seed was sown on Greek soil it produced a Greek type of Christianity, and on Roman soil a Roman type. So has the gospel adapted itself to different habitats as it passed out over the world and down through the centuries. There was a Medieval Christianity and to-day there are English and American, and German and French types, and already there are growing up a Japanese and a Korean, a Chinese and an Indian type of our common Christian faith and life. There are a Greek Orthodox, a Roman Catholic and a Protestant Christianity. The first century had its peculiar type, and so has the twentieth and so will have the twenty-fifth.

Some are suspicious and fearful of these varying types and would like to repress them and trim them all to their own pattern as hedges are trimmed, but they are as inevitable and necessary and good as are varieties of trees and flowers and fruits. Christianity will necessarily continue to be shaped and colored by its soil and whole habitat and thus progressively adapted to each successive country and age. The world could not live to-day on the coarse grasses of the early geological ages, and our Christian faith could not survive to-day on the low ethics of the early books of the Old Testament or on many of the religious ideas of the first Christian century or on the superstitions of the Middle Ages or on the science of the fifteenth century. In such a soil and climate the gospel seeds we are now sowing would wither and die. Our

soil has been fertilized and enriched by all our accumulated knowledge and experience in religion, literature, science and art, and Christianity has now become acclimated to this environment and could not grow in any other.

All this is implied in the gospel viewed as seed subject to growth and enrichment as it passes into new countries and centuries and civilizations and brings forth new flowers and fruits; and this is the principle of modernism.

The same principle is illustrated from another point of view in the teaching of Jesus as to the patching an old garment with new cloth and the putting of new wine in old wine-skins. The old skins grown inelastic and brittle with age cannot stand the pressure of the fermenting new wine and will burst and spill it. Therefore, Jesus taught that they should "put new wine into fresh wine-skins." The application is plain. The new wine of Christianity should not be put in the old wine-skins of Judaism. Growing religious life must have new forms, new credal expressions, more elastic thought-terms, new molds of government and administration. New knowledge sets up a fermentation of ideas that is infectious and will spread like leaven through the whole mass of ideas and infect the entire system of thought and life. There is no stopping this process. No iron band bound around the brain and no constriction imposed upon conscience can repress the working of this yeast. Sooner or later the old container of faith will burst, a crystallized creed will crack. Twentieth-century Christianity cannot be contained in fifth-century or fifteenth-century creeds and confessions. Neither can the old creed be patched up with new cloth, for the new will tear the old and make a worse rent. At times the old forms must be thrown aside and new molds cast. Repeatedly must our creeds be revised and our confessions of faith be reconstructed. Christianity must keep up to date and abreast of all our growing knowledge or its forms will become obsolete and be left behind.

Time and again has this process taken place and its record is written in all our church histories and histories of theology. Christianity in the very day of its birth was a mighty fermentation that the old wine-skins of Judaism could not hold, and they burst under the growing pressure. The Reformation was another period of

violent fermentation and again new wine-skins had to be formed. Often has advancing knowledge split asunder old creeds and formed new ones.

Paul understood this process and made room for it in his creed when he declared: "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours." He thus cut a wide swath through the future and gathered all things into his sheaf; he taxed the whole world to enrich his creed. Everything that was to come was so much grist for his theological mill, so much enlargement and enrichment of his Christian faith and life. We can extend the list that he thus began and say, All things are ours, whether Augustine or Calvin or Wesley, whether Milton or Shakespeare or Tennyson, whether Copernicus or Newton or Darwin or Kelvin, all are ours. Whatever truth there is in higher criticism or evolution belongs to us. All truth is of God and throws light upon God and enlarges and illumines our Christian faith.

We are right in the midst of this process now, this fermentation is going on throughout the whole field of our modern life. Many an old wine-skin is strained to the breaking point and new ones are being formed. This is the cause and meaning of much of the unrest and theological controversy in our churches, such as that between "fundamentalism" and "modernism": the new wine in many instances is stressing and distressing the old wine-skins. The process is unavoidable, and we must put up with it. Authoritative repression will not stop it, and it would be bad for Christianity if it could. And so we should be patient with it and with one another and try to pour the new wine into new wine-skins with as little trouble and loss as possible.

We now come to passages in which Jesus taught the principle of modernism even more explicitly. In his teaching Jesus was ordinarily addressing the people before him and not looking beyond them into the future; but sometimes he cast a wistful glance out upon a broader flock as when he said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice: and shall become one flock, one shepherd." At other times he slipped over the horizon of Palestine and gave wings to his vision and took in the whole world to the end of time. Luke

opens the Acts by announcing that "Jesus began both to do and to teach." He only began and did not complete. All he did and taught was only introductory and preparatory. He started the work and then committed it to others. He left much for other hands, even greater works than he did himself. The unfinished work and teaching of Jesus—what a suggestive fact and principle is this!

Jesus himself explained and expatiated upon this aspect of his work in his confidential table-talk with his disciples on the night before his crucifixion. He said to them:

> But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you. . . . I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you (John 14:26; 16:12-15).

Here Jesus stands as the Son of God "above the heads of his reporters," above all the ages, and speaks to all coming time. The point that stands out conspicuous is his declaration, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." This is a clear disclosure of endless vistas of truth yet to come. But the disciples were not ready for and could not bear it yet. This recognizes the principle that the revelation of truth is necessarily a gradual process and must not be crowded on growing minds too fast. There must be prepared for it the proper soil in which it can grow; there must be a general background and framework in which it can be set; there must be a content of apperception, to express it in the technical language of psychology, by which perception can be interpreted and illuminated. There would be no use in revealing to Ptolemy in the second century A. D. what could be apprehended only by Sir Isaac Newton in the seventeenth century. Too much light may blind the eye; too much fuel may smother the fire. The sun must not let all its energy loose at once for it would blight the planet in one blast. All that Jesus said was only a hint of what he might have said. But had he said too much he might have paralyzed his disciples and disorganized their

world. "Ye cannot bear them now" is a wise and merciful principle in the providence of God and in the teachings of Jesus.

But this principle equally provides for the progressive revelation of truth through all the ages. Truth never reaches a limit, but sweeps on in ever-widening curves. Jesus only began his teaching and now he is carrying it on through all the processes by which truth is discovered. Of course, this includes the work of his indwelling Spirit in the minds of men, but it also includes all the means and methods by which truth is discovered in any field. It includes the written Gospels and the Letters of Paul and all subsequent Christian literature.

Again let it be said and emphasized that all truth comes from God. It shines out from Him and then it is reflected back upon Him to reveal Him more clearly to us. Not only all religious but also all scientific truth is a growing revelation of God. "The heavens declare the glory of God" in ever more majestic splendor. All fields of truth are ever filling out the things that Christ did not say to his disciples because they could not bear them then, but they are being said to us because we can or ought to bear them now. Here is room and provision for boundless new theology.

Yet the new truth Jesus reveals is always harmonious with the old truth and is an extension and enlargement of it. His promise to the disciples was that the Spirit would "bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you," "for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." Thus his further revelations of truth through all means are ever enlargements and illuminations and wider applications of what he has already said. Old and new in his teaching and kingdom ever cohere into a larger and richer unity.

His teaching ever had room in it for more truth. His very words were germinal and expansive, and like seeds were ready to grow in any soil and yield far future harvests. It is wonderful how he avoided the peril of so involving his teaching in local and temporary traditional beliefs, current science and philosophy, that would embarrass his disciples in future ages. He even kept clear mostly of Jewish apocalyptic views and hopes. On the contrary, he used terms that still have kinship with our dominant ideas and readily lend themselves to our modern interpretation and use. There is a timeless element in his teaching so that the modernism

of all ages lies latent in his words. This fact has preserved his teaching from the fate of falling behind the progress of knowledge and becoming obsolete.

Various writers have commented on this aspect of his teaching. The Rev. S. D. McConnell, in his *Evolution of Immortality,* says "The Gospels are biological altogether," and proceeds to say: "It is little less than marvellous the way in which the words of Jesus fit in with the forms of thought which are to-day current. They are life, generation, survival of the fit, perishing of the unfit, tree and fruit, multiplication by cell growth as yeast, operation by chemical contact as salt, dying of the lonely seed to produce much fruit, imposition of a higher life upon a lower by being born from above, grafting a new scion upon an old stock, the phenomena of plant growth from the seed through the blade, the ear, and the matured grain, and, finally, the attainment of the individual life which has an eternal quality."[1] He thus cast his teaching in biological and evolutionary concepts which are the current coin of our modern world. To the same effect writes the physicist Robert A. Millikan: "The practical preaching of modern science is extraordinarily like the teaching of Jesus. The teaching of both science and Jesus is the saving of society. Science has neither added to nor subtracted anything from religion. Religion is the most striking example of evolution." A suggestive lecture on "The Philosophy of Jesus" by Herman Harrell Horne, Professor of the Philosophy of Education in New York University, closes with the following paragraph which is here appropriate: "It should be added that the philosophy of Jesus contains no attack on science or on speculation, and no appreciation for the wilful ignoramus or the obscurantist. It breathes the life-sustaining breath of liberty of thought and toleration of opinion. To attack it is easy, to reject it is possible, to refute it is impossible, to live by it, as multitudes have found, is inspiration, illumination and salvation, or wholeness of life."[2]

Thus Jesus not only spoke in the language of his day but he also used terms and phrases that were prophetic of coming science

---

[1] Pp. 135-36.

[2] *Jesus a Philosopher,* p. 38. Published by permission of the Abingdon Press, New York.

and philosophy and were expansive to receive and express them. This is one reason why the world has not yet caught up with him and he is a modernist in every age.

To sum up on this point, modernism in the teaching of Jesus is the principle of the progressive enlargement and unification of growing knowledge illustrated in his bringing the Old Testament up to date, revising and correcting it, giving old truths new meanings, sowing seed which would develop through future ages, providing new wine-skins for the new wine of fermenting new knowledge, revealing truth gradually as his followers could receive it, and using germinal and pregnant words that carried in their wombs the modernism of the future. Thus while he was a conservative and a fundamentalist in that he held fast to the truth and good contained in the old revelations, yet he was also a liberal and a modernist in that he ever made room for the new and welcomed it and provided for its incorporation in his own revelations as their further enlargement and enrichment. Still he has for us "a new teaching" and this is what is meant by modernism.

It need only be pointed out that this view does not impair or even touch the divinity of Christ's person or the inspiration of the Scriptures any more than does the fact that Jesus spoke in our human language and accommodated himself to our human conditions of space and time. His modernism was of a piece with his humanity and leaves his divinity in full play.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PRINCIPLE OF MODERNISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: II. THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

The risen Christ immediately created Christianity, and we now witness an epochal event and momentous transition. The new faith cuts loose from the moorings of the old faith and launches out upon the deep. How fares the new faith as it leaves its ancestral Hebrew home and starts out into the Gentile world on a road that will run around the earth? This is the question that now confronts us.

1. The Conflict of the Old Faith with the New

Old religion is always slow to change and instinctively resists new knowledge. So long has it been living in the dim twilight that the glare of the morning sun is painful to its eyes. It is by nature intensely conservative and rightly so. It does not want to tear down the old house until it is sure of a new roof. It dreads pulling up or even disturbing its old roots lest it lose its fruits also. And so it struggles bravely against the incoming tides of a strange sea. Often its dying agonies are pitiful and appeal to our sympathies. Paul looked with pathos on the idol which he took for his text on Mars' Hill. Yet he did not destroy that idol, but used it as an altar-step up to the true God. He did not blow out that feeble torch but with it lighted the way into the presence of the Light of the world. Missionaries often look with pain upon the pathetic distress of inquirers struggling out of old pagan into new Christian faith. We should ever have this spirit of sympathy and helpfulness towards old forms of religion giving way before new knowledge. No disposition should be in us to disparage or ridicule the old or to win a partisan victory over it as if we were seeking a personal triumph; rather should we take our stand on

common ground with the old, as Paul did at Athens, and seek to win its sympathy and lead it into new light.

The most fundamental and violent conflict in the history of the Christian church occurred at its birth and start when a death-struggle was precipitated between Judaism and Christianity.

2. Stephen the First Martyr for Modernism

The first Christians supposed that they were still Jews in religion as well as in race and worshiped Jehovah according to the ordinances of Moses. Evidently they had not thought the matter through and went on with their worship after the death of Jesus just as they did before. Only Jews were present on the day of Pentecost and Peter[1] in his sermon gave no indication of being aware of any break with the old church. Immediately after the great day of Pentecost we find Peter and John "going up into the temple at the hour of prayer" as they always had done. They regarded the Christian church as a form of Judaism, perhaps a further development or fulfilment but not as a supercession of it. The apostles at first all held to this view and practiced it. Peter in his collision with the Jews maintained that Jesus was the prophet whom Moses had predicted, but did not raise the issue of the relation of Moses to Jesus.

But soon the fact of the relation of Christianity to Judaism, which at first lay in the background, was forced to the front and became a burning issue and great battle that fills much of the New Testament. It is true that this issue was involved in the conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees, but this was largely a personal controversy and did not expressly raise the main question. This issue came to a crisis in the relations between the Jewish church and the Christian church. The Pharisees thought they had ended the trouble connected with the heresy of Jesus by crucifying the heretic, but his reported resurrection brought the whole matter back upon them in a more dangerous form than ever. They now took meas-

[1] In quoting his text from Joel, Peter said, "This is that," "this" manifestation of the Spirit is "that" which was predicted by the prophet, and thus he brought the old forward and found its fulfilment in the new; and this is the principle of modernism.

ures against the preaching of the apostles, and Peter was soon in jail a first and then a second time. Persecution was let loose and Jerusalem burst into a flaming volcano breathing fire and slaughter against the Christians. Paul appeared as the powerful protagonist of the old faith against the new. Yet even in the midst of their persecutions the apostles did not completely and finally break with the old church, but declared, "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Servant Jesus" (Acts 3:13). They apparently still thought of themselves as members of the old church and were not fully aware of all the implications of their new faith.

This sharp break and final severance came with the preaching of Stephen. Elected a deacon, he soon proved to be one of the most powerful and eloquent of the preachers of the new faith and he was the first to catch a vision of its meaning. He began boldly to proclaim the truth that the old dispensation had had its day and must disappear before the new and to shake the Christian church loose from the narrowness and bondage of Moses, which was good and necessary in its time, and let it out into the liberty of Christ.

Such a man needed looking after by the opponents of the new faith and they were not slow to rise against him. We are not told what doctrine Stephen preached, but we can gather it from the charges brought against him. Perjured witnesses were suborned against him, and while their accusations were false in spirit, yet they were true in substance, for Stephen did not deny them and his own defense bore them out. It was false that he spoke blasphemy, but it was true that he did preach doctrines which seemed to "certain of them that were of the synagogue" to be destructive and sacrilegious. He did "speak words against this holy place, and the law," though not in the sense and spirit imputed to him. It was doubtless true that the witnesses heard him say, in substance if not in words, "that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us," for Jesus himself had asserted this very thing when he declared to the woman of Samaria, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father" (John 4:21). To an orthodox Jew

no more radically heretical and terribly destructive blasphemy could have been uttered.

As the charges were being made against Stephen, the members of the council fastened their eyes on him and saw an unexpected and wonderful sight. His face grew transfigured before them and became as it had been the face of an angel. Stephen seems to have discerned that his hour had come and that his blood would be the first to baptize the new faith. Some great thought or passion kindled his soul into flames that shone through his flesh and lit it up with heavenly radiance. The man was so nearly pure spirit that his body was the thinnest possible veil that could scarcely contain and conceal the burning inner glory.

With his soul thus aflame, Stephen began his defense. His long address is one of the most notable speeches in the Bible and repays careful study and analysis. The drift of his argument is proof from Scripture that God had not confined Himself to the Holy Land and sacred places but had repeatedly gone outside of these in revealing Himself. The address was broken off before the argument was completed, but its logic and conclusion are clear. His whole handling of the history makes it plain that Stephen was not hostile to Moses and was a loyal Jew. But he shows that God had not restricted His grace to any one "place" and "custom," but had revealed Himself in many places and through many prophets. He was proving that divine revelation was not a static and finished product, but a progressive process.

This rapturous speech and convincing logic were too much for his judges, and, stopping their ears that they might not hear the hateful words, with shouts of rage they rushed upon him and, in violation of Roman law, hurried him through the gate of the city to the place of stoning, where murderous missiles hurtled through the air and Stephen was quickly struck down, expiring with the Christlike cry upon his lips, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

So died the first martyr of the new faith. And he died that the new might live and not be strangled by the old. Judaism was the conservatism and fundamentalism, Christianity was the liberalism and modernism of the day. And Judaism tried to crush Christianity in its cradle. It feared it as a deadly enemy, whereas

Christianity was its own child and held in its bosom the destiny and glory of the future. Stephen saw the significance of Christianity as the outgrowth and fulfilment of Judaism and stood for the rights of the new faith at the cost of his life. It is not straining language, but is stating the true principle of the event, to say that he died as the first martyr for modernism in the Apostolic church.

3. Peter the Progressive

The scenes shift rapidly in the early years of the Apostolic church and we next find Peter down at Joppa on a missionary tour among the Jews. In a dream-vision a great sheet containing all manner of beasts was let down before him and he was bidden to eat. He flatly refused on the ground that he had never eaten anything unclean. The meaning of this parable was that he was to take the gospel to the Gentiles, but he held them to be outside the pale of Christianity and would have nothing to do with them. He was still a Jew with all the prejudices of Judaism against Gentiles.

Forty miles to the north, at Cæsarea, a Roman officer Cornelius had also had a vision in which he was told to send for Peter. Presently Peter appeared before Cornelius and his family and heard the Gentile tell the story of his experience. The Jew was astonished at the revelation and it wrought in him a profound revolution. Peter's creed and habit of thought and heredity distilled into him out of more than a thousand years of racial history experienced a sudden shock at the discovery. His most deeply inbred thought was that God was a respecter of persons; that He put a wide difference between the Jew and the Gentile with all the favor on the side of the Jew. But this wide distinction and unbridgeable chasm in his mind was here suddenly blotted out; in a moment it closed up and he saw with amazement that there is no such distinction, and that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him."

Peter now delivered his message. He first gave an outline of the grace of God in the gospel. God sent the word to the children of Israel through Jesus Christ who was anointed of the Holy Ghost

and whose life was compressed into one marvelous shining line, "who went about doing good." Yet the Jews hanged him on the cross, but God raised him up and showed him openly. To these facts Peter gives his personal testimony as an eyewitness. Then Peter declared that he was charged to preach Christ unto the people as the Judge of the living and the dead, and broadened his message out into the universal promise that "through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

This breadth and universality of the divine grace had lain latent in the Jewish Scriptures, but now it shone out in splendor, and Peter realized it for the first time and it came to him as a wonderful revelation and revolution. While he yet spake the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word, and then "they of the circumcision that believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." These Jewish Christians were getting their eyes opened to the universal grace of God. The gospel there and then began to push out across the boundaries of Judaism into the wide Gentile world. Peter was now traveling the same road that Stephen had opened, and a great day was dawning. Peter was literally a liberal and a progressive. He refused to stand still in the tracks of the fathers, but moved forward as new light fell upon his path. Peter also was a modernist.

4. The First Council at Jerusalem: Modernism the Issue

The news of what Peter had done down at Cæsarea rapidly spread through Judea and was soon matter of talk up at Jerusalem. The report abroad was that "the Gentiles had received the word of God." This raised the great issue that could now no longer be evaded, What was to be the relation of the Christian church to the Gentiles? Were they to be admitted on equal terms with the Jews, or were they to be excluded and the Christian church confined to a Jewish sect? This was the greatest issue and epochal decision that could confront the church, and history trembled in the balance the day the apostles and brethren met to decide it.

The decision was made at a council held at Jerusalem. Peter, learning of the dissatisfaction, took with him six brethren who had

been with him at Cæsarea and went up to Jerusalem to give an account of himself. There "they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them."

Who were these men "of the circumcision"? They were Christian Jews who still held to the law of Moses and believed that only circumcised Jews could be admitted to the Christian church. They, therefore, retained all the Jewish prejudices against the uncircumcised Gentiles. Peter by eating with Cornelius had thus violated their religious creed in one of its most vital points and had shocked them beyond measure. A breach of the Ten Commandments would not have been such a dreadful scandal in their view.

So these Jewish converts had not yet got a glimpse of the splendid breadth and universality of Christianity and were still hemmed in and blinded by their own narrow bigotry. They still drew the boundary and limit of God's grace around their own Jewish race and left the Gentiles out in the darkness. They still thought they were the favorites of heaven and had a monopoly of its grace, and that all who were outside its pale were left to perish. Let us not think that this spirit expired when the last Pharisee passed out of the world, for it is still lurking in some quarters of the Christian church.

Peter himself had at first been of this way of thinking, not only when he was a Jew, but even after he had become a Christian. He now told the story of his conversion to these offended Jews. The vision on the flat-roofed house of Simon the tanner at Joppa, the great sheet with its beasts, the command to eat which had so shocked him, the arrival at the same hour of the messengers from Cornelius, his visit to the Roman officer at Cæsarea and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles "as on us at the beginning" were graphically described.

"Then remembered I," proceeded Peter, "the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized you with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Peter had heard Jesus say these words, but he did not fully understand the promise at the time and now it began to blaze out in its breadth and brightness. All these rays of truth and lines of evidence converged into such a flood of light and overwhelming proof that Peter could no longer stand by

his old convictions, but his whole mind and heart gave way to the manifest universality of the grace of God in Christ.

The effect of the narrative was decisive upon his prejudiced hearers. If Peter had entered into a theological argument with them to try to convert them to his view, he probably would have only confirmed them in their opinions and exasperated them. But his plain recital of facts silently undermined their prejudice, and the whole structure of their hereditary exclusiveness crumbled down.

"And when they heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life." They also could not resist the logic of events and withstand the manifest grace of God. Their noisy clamor against Peter's irregularity and scandal in associating with the uncircumcised quieted down, they held their peace, often a very hard thing to do, they grew attentive and receptive, and they ended by glorifying God for His universal grace.

It was a great day in the Christian church when this victory was won. Had these Jewish Christians, who are commonly called "Judaizers," been able to fasten their view upon Christianity and bind it with their racial constriction, they would have doomed it to remain a Jewish sect and it never would have reached us. This victory released it from its Jewish shell in which it had been hatched and let it spread its wings for its flight out over the world. We need to appreciate and glory in this universal breadth of the gospel and proclaim it far and wide that unto all men of every race and nation and class and condition God hath granted repentance unto life.

We see how the truth and the church grew through the discipline of controversy. The early church was disturbed and torn with these discussions and dissensions as to doctrine and polity so that the first Christian centuries seem a sea of strife. And yet it was through these controversies that great doctrines were wrought out and established, and never did Christianity have a more rapid and vigorous growth and win mightier victories than during these times.

Controversy is never to be sought for its own sake, and it should be avoided when this can be righteously done. But there are worse

things than controversy. Dullness and deafness to spiritual things are more fatal to life. The spirit of investigation and criticism, of revision and reconstruction, of unrest and change, of progressive discovery of new truth, is the spirit and life of the church. These things show that the Spirit of God is working in the church and fulfilling the promise of Christ that he would yet reveal many things, and that Christian men are still alive and thinking. And when discussion and even controversy are carried on in a Christian spirit of mutual toleration and love, they are sure to issue in some broader view of truth and wider and deeper experience of God's grace.

The issue at stake in this first council at Jerusalem was the principle of modernism. Should Christianity move forward into the clearer light and broader world of the new day, or should it stand still in its ancient tracks as an exclusive and secluded racial religion? Should the new faith suffer itself to be restricted and strangled in its cradle, or should it stand upon its own feet and go out on its world-wide mission? It was Judaism or Christianity, and never was the principle of modernism more plainly expressed and more momentously at stake. Modernism won, and this is why we are Christians to-day.

5. Broadening Liberalism at Antioch

The echoes of the great persecution in the days of Stephen long reverberated through the world. That violent explosion shot flying embers of the church far from Jerusalem and we find them at many points around the Mediterranean shore. One of these points that stands out conspicuous as one of the most important centers in the spread of Christianity was Antioch. It was situated three hundred miles north of Jerusalem on the river Orontes, twenty miles from the sea. It was the third city in the Roman world, Rome being first and Alexandria second, but it was first in corruption and vice so that even Rome complained that the Syrian Orontes had befouled the Roman Tiber.

To this city came certain of the scattered disciples and began to preach the Lord Jesus to "the Greeks." This announcement marks a radical and revolutionary departure in preaching the gospel.

There had been the sporadic instances of Philip at Gaza and of Peter at Cæsarea, but these disciples deliberately and openly preached the Lord Jesus to Greeks, the heathen residents of Antioch. All distinctions between Jew and Gentile had been blotted from their minds and they saw and seized the great truth that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of all men without regard to their race or rank or religion. Uncircumcision was no longer a bar to conversion. The ceremonial law was gone, and grace had come. Moses was no longer master, and Christ was Lord of all.

It was remarkable that this revolutionary policy was not inaugurated by church authorities up at Jerusalem or by ordained apostles and deacons, but by unordained and unauthorized laymen down in a pagan city. Certain men from Cyprus and Cyrene, points far from the seat and source of Christianity, began this business, apparently of their own accord, moved by the wider and freer spirit that was bred in the hearts of those out in the field of heathenism in close contact with its needs.

This principle has been frequently exemplified in the history of the church. Great forward movements, such as the Reformation in Germany, the Wesleyan revival in England, the Sunday school and the Salvation Army, did not originate with ecclesiastical authorities, but with unofficial ministers and laymen among the common people. Even when the angels came to announce the birth of Jesus they did not go to priests and doctors of divinity up in the Temple, but to shepherds out in a sheep pasture where there were more sheep than men to hear. Humble human souls are ever the dear Lord's best interpreters. The official heads of the church, as represented by popes and councils, conferences and general assemblies, are generally conservative and obstructive, slow to hear new truth and quick to suspect and oppose it, and the Holy Spirit usually pours new life and grows new organs of operation down among the people. Often new movements start far from the original centers of faith. It is the spirit of Christian unity developed among foreign missionaries and native Christians abroad that clarifies and widens our vision and brings our churches closer together at home.

The news of what was going on down in Antioch soon came up to the church in Jerusalem and it was determined to send a com-

mittee of investigation to Antioch to look into the situation. Church authorities do not ordinarily start new movements, but they usually want to manage them after they are started; and this is right provided they do not try to obstruct and strangle them.

The Jerusalem church was fortunate in the choice of its commissioner to Antioch. Barnabas was chosen. He was himself from Cyprus, not far from Antioch, and was thus qualified to understand the people and the conditions in that city. Better still, "he was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and faith," and was, therefore, a man of broad sympathies whose goodness of heart enabled him to appreciate men and movements that a narrow ecclesiastic would have quickly run foul of and condemned.

When he came to Antioch he saw the grace of God. A differently constituted and tempered man might have seen something to suspect and brand with the name of heresy, or "modernism," but Barnabas saw grace. And he was glad and exhorted them all with purpose of heart that they would cleave unto the Lord. He saw the new policy was inspired of God and he urged it forward; and yet he endeavored to guard it from ephemeral enthusiasm and to guide it along solid and permanent lines.

Again the principle of modernism was followed. The gospel was broadened out to include Gentiles, and a Christian church was established outside the sacred precincts of Palestine in a Greek city. The Great Commission of Christ is now receiving wider fulfilment and has launched out upon the deeps of the pagan world. Christianity has now started on its grand world march. It saw the light of the new opportunity and adapted itself to the broader field. It came up abreast of its growing revelation and opportunity and experience, and this is modernism.

6. Paul the Master Modernist

Paul was a Hebrew university graduate and a lawyer and influential rabbi in Jerusalem, and also a Roman citizen. Born in Tarsus in Asia Minor, he was bred in Greek culture and could quote Greek literature. Three civilizations thus met and mingled in his blood. He was a man of acute and powerful intellect, of logic all compact, yet of poetic and fiery temperament, a keen

thinker and forceful writer, who could sound the depths of philosophy or let loose his thoughts on the wings of imagination, and an impassioned orator who could put the spell of his eloquent speech on vast audiences. Many-sided, variously gifted, unspotted in character, deeply religious, terribly conscientious, tremendously in earnest in his convictions and volcanic in his emotions, adventurous and masterful, he was one of the great men of his age and of all ages and has helped to shape all the Christian centuries.

At first Paul was a bitter enemy of Christ and his gospel. An intensely orthodox Jew in birth and blood and training and zeal, he regarded Christ as the greatest heretic and most dangerous man in the world, and his soul blazed in hatred toward his disciples and he breathed out slaughter against them. He stood holding the clothes of those who stoned Stephen the martyr, and next we find him on the way to Damascus to carry the work of death far beyond Jerusalem.

On this journey occurred his memorable conversion that burnt itself deep into his brain and left a vivid impression which he never could forget or misunderstand or confuse in its objective reality with any subjective illusion or delusion. It is one of the most dramatic pages in the history of Christianity and remains to this day as one of its epochal events.

Three years after his conversion Paul went up to Jerusalem where he joined the apostles, and then he returned to Tarsus where he remained about ten years in seclusion. These were the silent years of Paul in which he was deepening his roots and gathering strength and ripened wisdom and unconquerable resolution for the work to which he had been called, to preach to the Gentiles.

As the work grew in Antioch under Barnabas he needed help and went after Paul, whom he had met before in Jerusalem, and brought him to Antioch where the two men worked together. The little church in Antioch presently felt the urge and call of the Spirit to send out foreign missionaries, and it selected Paul and Barnabas, its two ablest men, for this service. They went westward through Cyprus and then crossed over into Asia Minor and preached in four mountain villages, leaving converts forming a little church in each of them. They then retraced their steps and returned to their home base.

No sooner had Paul and Barnabas arrived in Antioch from their first missionary journey than they were confronted with a great crisis. "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." This is akin to but not just the same question that had been settled at the first council at Jerusalem. There the question was, Shall Gentile converts be admitted to the Christian church? Here the question is, Shall they be admitted without being circumcised? Defeated on the first point, these Judaizers are bringing up practically the same issue in another form.

We must try to put ourselves in the place of these Judaizers and see the situation from their point of view. It seemed to them that the admission of Gentiles into the church without circumcision was destructive of the whole system of Moses that had been consecrated by more than a thousand years of glorious history. This was a terrible wrench and shock to their orthodox consciences, and we may well appreciate, if not sympathize with, their sore experience. Yet however conscientious they were, they were not blameless in their blindness to the breadth and liberty of the gospel. Paul calls them "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, that they might bring us into bondage" (Gal. 2:4).

Pharisees before conversion, the Pharisaic spirit clung to them after conversion. Conservatism in them was crystallized into fixity and finality. They were narrow, rigid literalists who could see no room in religion for any difference of opinion. And so they went about among brethren as spies and heresy hunters, stirring up dissension and subverting souls. We have not yet seen the passing of all the people that say that others must believe after their manner, or "ye cannot be saved."

Paul also at this time and place encountered this Judaistic propaganda in another quarter. Judaizers had already got in among his Galatian converts, following closely on his heels through the towns in Galatia where he had only recently founded churches, and it probably was at this time in Antioch that he wrote his Epistle to the Galatians. "I marvel," he begins, "that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto

another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ" (1:6-7). The Epistle from start to finish is a trumpet blast against fastening the Mosaic ceremonies on the Gentile converts, and into this liberty Paul pours all the invincible logic of his mind and passionate heat and vehemence of his heart. "The business of the letter," as John Locke long ago saw and said, "is to dehort and hinder the Galatians from bringing themselves under the bondage of the Mosaical law," and it does this with a vengeance. The main body of the Epistle is an impetuous and impassioned argument and plea against the bondage of the law which was being forced on the Gentile converts and for the liberty of believers in Christ. "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you . . .? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect in the flesh?" (3:1, 3). Paul felt that if these Galatian churches of his were led away into Judaism his work would be wrecked, and hence he fights as for the life of his children and for his own life in defending the liberty of the gospel and salvation by faith alone.

Paul, the greatest theologian, the most powerful apostle and preacher and most masterful leader the Christian church has ever had, thus stood in the Apostolic church for liberty, the liberty of the new against the bondage of the old, for forward-moving liberalism against reactionary conservatism, and more than any other man he helped to win this far-reaching victory. Paul also was a modernist.

7. The Second Council at Jerusalem: Modernism Again the Issue

The appearance of the Judaizers at Antioch declaring to the Gentile converts, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved," led to a second council at Jerusalem to settle this question. The first council admitted Gentile converts to the Christian church, but now the issue was whether, being admitted, they must submit to the Mosaic rite of circumcision. It was another attempt to fasten a form of the old faith on the new faith and again the issue was liberty, or adapting the old faith to the modernism of the day.

The delegates appointed to attend this second council, consisting of Paul and Barnabas and "certain other of them," set off from Antioch and traveled by land three hundred miles southward, strengthening and heartening the brethren by the way. Arrived at Jerusalem, they were received by the church and told their story of God's doings among the Gentiles. They were again confronted with the demand of the Pharisaic Christians that the Gentiles be circumcised and the law of Moses imposed upon them.

The conference then met and the different views were considered. Peter was the first speaker. He reviewed the circumstances of his own conversion to the principle of liberty and protested against putting a yoke on the Gentiles that the Jews themselves were unwilling to bear. Peter had wavered on this matter at an earlier day (Gal. 2:11-12), but he stood staunch and true in this critical hour.

A great silence fell on the conference as Paul and Barnabas rose to speak. The exploits of these missionaries had made them illustrious and they had come back as generals from a great victory with their honors thick upon them. They recited the story of their famous campaign and rehearsed the wonders that God had wrought among the Gentiles.

Then James, the brother of Jesus and head of the church in Jerusalem, spoke. He was a sympathizer with, if not a supporter of, the Judaistic party (Gal. 2:12), and might have been expected to oppose Peter and Paul. But he took strong ground in favor of Gentile liberty and quoted from the prophets to prove his position. The principle of universal salvation was in the Old Testament all the while, but the Jews did not see it until the light of the gospel fell on its pages and brought it out in luminous lines. The speech of James was decisive and the council came to a unanimous conclusion which was embodied in a letter to the churches.

This council illustrates the true method and spirit of handling religious differences. "And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." They did not stand apart and refuse to meet each other and fight it out to the bitter end, but they came together for friendly discussion. They sat down and talked it over and then reached a decision with unexpected unanimity. Conference is far more effective in settling differences and

disputes than controversy. Controversy heats the blood and intensifies personal convictions and partisan spirit and deepens differences, but conference cools passion and emphasizes points of agreement. In all our disputes, especially in religion, we should strive to come together to consider the matter in an amicable spirit.

The decision of the council was embodied in a letter that has been preserved for us and is one of the most important documents in the history of Christianity. It is the Magna Charta of our right as Gentiles to share in the gospel of Christ without coming under the bondage of the Mosaic law.

The letter consists of an introduction giving the history of the matter, and a resolution or exhortation stating the decision. It first addresses the Gentiles as brethren and next repudiates the troublers of the church. Paul and Barnabas are strongly commended, thus receiving complete vindication. Finally, in the name of the Holy Ghost it lays upon the Gentiles no unnecessary burden but bids them abstain from things sacrificed to idols, from things strangled, and from adultery.

There are thus in the letter some elements of compromise. While the Gentiles were released from the ceremonial law of Moses, especially from circumcision, the main point at issue, yet they were to have regard for the prejudices and feelings of the Jews and not wantonly offend them in their social practices. Eating meat offered to idols and then exposed for sale in the market was offensive to the Jews as they believed this involved them in the worship of such pagan gods, while abstaining from it violated no conscientious principle but was only an act of Christian forbearance on the part of the Gentile converts. But there was no division of the church, neither party sought to exclude the other, and room was found for both and the unity of the church was maintained. The moral law of Moses, however, remained as one of the things that cannot be shaken.

This letter is in itself a fine instance of modernism. It adjusts the old faith and the new knowledge into harmony with kindly tact and with a just discrimination between the non-essential and the essential factors in the problem, relinquishing the one while retaining the other. There was no note of triumph or boastful spirit in the letter, but it was couched in terms that gave satis-

faction to all and offense to none. There is generally room and need for these good points in settling our religious differences.

Thus this second council brought these brethren into unexpected agreement and consolidated the church in the principle and policy of universal salvation with freedom from the ceremonial law of Moses. Christianity was again saved from Jewish conservatism and sectarianism and from schism and was finally released from its Judaistic swaddling clothes and set free to start out unimpeded on its world-wide march and conquest. It is because of this epochal decision made at these councils that we are Christians to-day. Modernism saved the day for us.

8. Modernistic Writings in the New Testament

There are some distinctively modernistic writings in the New Testament that call for consideration.

(1) *The Gospel According to Matthew.* Matthew's point of view and purpose are plain: he is writing to the Jews to show that Jesus is the Messiah of the Old Testament. This purpose begins with the genealogy and continues through the visit of the Magi and runs through the whole teaching of the book that the gospel fulfils and expands the law of Moses, down to the form of the inscription on the cross and the great commission as carrying out the Messianic predictions of the prophets. "Think not that I am come to destroy, but fulfil" (5:17) is a principle in the teaching of Jesus that Matthew never lets his readers forget.

In line with this purpose, Matthew quotes the Old Testament more frequently than any other evangelist, giving twenty-nine such quotations, ten of which are peculiar to himself. When we compare Matthew with parallel passages in Mark, we find that often when Mark makes a simple statement of fact Matthew confirms and enriches it with a quotation from the Old Testament. Thus, when Mark states that Jesus and his disciples "went into Capernaum" (1:21), Matthew states that this was done "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet" (4:14), and quotes Isaiah 9:1-2. "To Mark's simple statement that Jesus withdrew himself to the sea after the collision with the Pharisees, occasioned by the healing on the Sabbath of the man with the withered hand

(Mark 3:7), the first evangelist attaches a fine prophetic picture, as if to show readers the true Jesus as opposed to the Jesus of the Pharisaic imagination (Matt. 12:15-21). From these instances we see his method. He is not inventing history, but enriching history with prophetic emblazonments for apologetic purposes, or for increase of edification."[2]

Matthew is thus on every page connecting the gospel with the Old Testament and showing that the teaching of the prophets is fulfilled in the person and mission and kingdom of Jesus as the true Messiah, and is removing doubts and misgivings from the minds of Jewish converts and confirming them in the Christian faith. He also, along with Stephen and Peter and Paul and James, is endeavoring to ease the shock of the transition from the old faith into the new. He is building a bridge across the chasm between Judaism and Christianity; his book is another contribution to the battle between conservatism and liberalism, a distinctively modernistic rendering of the gospel to adjust it to his day and make it acceptable to Jewish converts.

(2) *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* The Epistle to the Hebrews is unique among the books of the New Testament in several respects. It contains no internal indications of its authorship and of the time and place of its writing and of the location of the readers to whom it is addressed. The Epistle is also unique in that it sets out to prove a definite proposition which is logically maintained from beginning to end. It comes nearer to being a systematic treatise than any other book in the Bible. Its proposition is that the Old Dispensation of the Mosaic Law is fulfilled and superseded by the New Dispensation of the Gospel. It announces its theme in the stately sentence with which it opens (1:1-4) in which it is declared that God, Who had spoken in various times and ways to the fathers or prophets, has in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, who is the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person. Christ is thus at once enthroned above Moses and angels, and presently the cross is set above the altar, and this line of logic runs through the great argument as a musical theme rolls and recurs through a grand symphony or sonata.

It was, therefore, evidently addressed to Jewish Christians who

---

[2] *Expositor's Greek Testament,* Vol. I, p. 41.

were called upon to make the great sacrifice and undergo the profound shock and change of passing from Moses to Christ, from Judaism, with all its sacred roots and associations of a thousand years, to Christianity, a new religion in their view, and from the Temple, with its elaborate and gorgeous ceremonies, to the simple worship of a Christian church.

The tendency was strong among these Jewish converts to fall back under the spell and into the practice of Judaism, and to resist this tendency was the great battle of the early churches, as we have been showing. Paul and other apostles were the magnificent champions for freedom from Moses under Christ. The unknown author of Hebrews eloquently defended and contended for the same liberty. When it is considered how hard it is for people with long-settled religious convictions to give up or even modify and modernize established and sacrosanct orthodoxy in order to accept new forms of truth, we may appreciate the hard and agonizing struggle it cost these Jewish Christians to make the transition from their old to their new faith. This Epistle is one of the historic landmarks of this change, an outstanding monument of this ancient battlefield. It is a beautiful instance of modernism, or of the progressive unification of religious experience in thought and life, and as such it has its lesson for us to-day. The same process is still going on, accompanied in some instances with the same struggle and pain.

(3) *Paul's Letter to the Galatians.* We have already referred to Paul's Letter to the Galatians as a modernistic document in which he resists with all his might the attempt of the Judaizers, or fundamentalists of the day, to fasten the ceremonial law and letter of the Old Testament on the new spirit of liberty in Christ and thereby strangle the gospel to death in its very cradle. The value of the Letter remains unimpaired to this day. "The more one studies the Letter to the Galatians, the more one feels its application to all time. To Luther, the letter was a supreme value. To every man who stands for the right of religion to outgrow its earlier forms, the letter is a trumpet call to courage. Paul took religion out of the realm of law and fear and put it in the realm of liberty and life. He tried, as many a man is trying to-day, to free Christianity from the past from which it sprang. The past

is not unimportant, but in so far as it depends on conditions which are outgrown, it is itself outgrown. Any new experience of God, any new knowledge of man and nature demand an expanding religious thought, larger liberty, more earnest reliance upon spiritual experience than upon inherited standards and methods. Either Christianity is to be a religion of freedom in which the Christian can be led into more truth, or it will be an imperfect religion of authority. Where Paul would stand in the present controversy over the attempt to limit Christian faith to the formulas of the past, can easily be inferred from this letter. He would not throw discredit upon the past, but neither would he permit the past to prevent men from enjoying the liberty for which Christ set us free. To retard progress in religion weakens faith in Jesus to-day as truly as in the days of Paul."[3]

9. General Modernistic Elements in the New Testament

We have so far been tracing the principle of modernism at points in New Testament teaching and church life where it came out into the open and was raised as a distinct and definite issue. There remains a wide element in the New Testament in which this principle is implied or illustrated in the process of bringing the gospel up to date by expressing it in the thought-terms of its own time.

The New Testament, being written in Greek, necessarily derived from that language something more, and much more, than the mere words in which it was expressed. The words of any language not only convey their primary significations but also carry with them subtle associations and suggestions and implications that cannot be divested from their express contents. When words are chosen to transmit ideas from one language to another these marginal or atmospheric implications or overtones go along with them and mingle with the expressed ideas. The very language of the New Testament, while avowedly expressing Jewish ideas, yet colored and tinctured these ideas with Greek associations. Not only the Greek language poured into the New Testament, but along with it

---

[3] *The Letter to the Galatians with Historical Introduction by Shailer Mathews*, p. 10.

slipped in a stream of Greek ideas and suggestions that helped to shape and color the book. Any important Greek word in it is thus more or less saturated with Greek thought and life.

Not only so, but there are instances in which Greek words with their ideas are deliberately adopted for the purpose of expressing and modernizing the gospel. A notable instance of this is the word "Logos" translated "Word" in the opening verses of John's Gospel. This word was in use in the Greek city of Alexandria and was expressly used by the philosopher Philo, a Jewish Hellenist or Grecian Jew in that city, as a designation of divine reason in action, or deity expressing itself in self-revelation or creation. Philo was a mediator between Judaism and Greek philosophy and used the word as a bridge or link binding the two together and making Judaism acceptable to Greeks. John thus found it shaped to his use and applied it to Christ. As a word is the revelation or expression of the mind, so is Christ the Logos or glorious Word or revelation of God, or God in action and self-revelation. It is true that John put a fuller Christian meaning into the word, and yet he adopted this Greek word as a means of expressing and interpreting Christ to the readers of his day in whose language he was writing. In so doing he modernized the gospel by expressing it in modern terms.[4]

We may find some parallel between John's use of this word "logos" and the use of the word "evolution" in our day. There may have been some prejudice against the use of "logos," a word and idea so deeply saturated with Greek philosophy, as a name for Christ. To some of his readers it must have looked like paganizing the gospel or a dangerous form of "modernism." But John boldly used it and ran the risk of any such misinterpretation because he was writing for Greeks and the word carried the gospel into their minds and expressed for them a meaning that no other word would so well express. In like manner the word "evolution" has come into general use in our day as a word that expresses the method and means of creation. The word meets with objection and gives offense

[4] The Fourth Gospel was, in its day and degree, a modernized version of the gospel, for it was the product of the later light and reflection of John or of the next generation of Christian believers.

in some quarters because it is felt that it describes only material and mechanical processes and thus excludes God from the world. Yet Christian thinkers and writers increasingly use the word because it expresses the method of the divine process without any such materialistic implications and is thus a necessary word in modernizing our theistic faith.[5]

There are countless instances in which Greek words not only expressed but imparted fresh meaning to the gospel ideas. The word translated "propitiation" in Romans 3:25, a critical word in connection with Christ's atoning death, has recently had new light thrown upon it from its use in Greek worship in which it was applied to a sacrifice offered to God to appease or satisfy him.[6]

Not only did Greek words, however recharged with Christian meanings, necessarily carry Greek implications into the teaching of the New Testament, but Greek principles of philosophy and theology were also incorporated in it. Paul's letters are especially tinctured and colored with these foreign ideas more or less derived from or influenced by pagan philosophies and religious cults. Christianity has a native affinity with any and all truth and selects and absorbs and assimilates it from any source, and so as it went out through the world it appropriated and transformed Greek thought and Roman law and pagan religion; and in its march down through the centuries it has continued this process to this day. It has an enormous digestive capacity and has thus grown and enriched itself through its whole history.

Paul, Greek by birth and education as well as Hebrew, had a sponge-like mind to soak up both Greek and Hebrew learning and expressly taught and practiced the art of appropriating truth from any source. "For all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or

---

[5] The word "modernism" itself illustrates this point. Because it has had sinister meanings imputed to it, it raises specters and frightens or offends some excellent people, and we may be asked, Why use it at all? The answer is that it exactly expresses the principle we are unfolding and no other word is so good for this purpose. And so we use it at the risk of some misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

[6] Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East* and other works of his throw a flood of light on many Greek words in the New Testament.

things to come; all are yours." The scholars trace for us the presence or influence of Greek thought in Paul's letters and this opens a large subject of which only a few instances can be given.[7]

Paul's affinity if not his acquaintance with Plato's philosophy at points is striking. The fundamental principle of Plato's philosophy is his doctrine of Ideas as the realities of which all sensible objects are shadows.

> The world of Ideas and the world of sense are related as substance to shadow. It is the function of sensible objects to awaken the mind to perceive the Idea, which is the sole reality. It was by means of his theory of Ideas that Plato arrived at the new thought of a spiritual world possessing transcendent worth. In its search for truth the soul must concern itself with higher objects than the ever-changing perceptions and impressions of everyday life, and penetrate beyond the dim shadows of the visible to the abiding realities of the unseen. To this ideal world of Plato a striking parallel is afforded by the Pauline doctrine of a heavenly and eternal world in which alone the soul can attain to perfect blessedness. The language used with regard to the necessarily defective knowledge open to sojourners upon earth ("For now we see in a mirror, darkly," I Cor. 13:12) recalls Plato's famous illustration of the cave. The apostle declares that in our present condition our knowledge comes through an imperfect medium like the dimly reflecting mirrors of his time; the Greek philosopher, that what we see around us is but the visible image of invisible reality—moving shadows of the eternal, the perfect, and the true. Both alike represent the things of sense and time as but the shadows of the real and eternal. With St. Paul Plato might have said: "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. 4:18).[8]

Points of similarity if not of connection between Paul's doctrine of asceticism and of his general attitude towards the flesh and Seneca's stoicism have also been traced. "It is highly probable that the tendency to make a display of asceticism shown by early Christianity is partly traceable to Stoic influences. . . . Still another illustration of Stoic influence occurs in the Pauline concep-

---

[7] A recent illuminating work on the subject is Dr. William Fairweather's *Jesus and the Greeks*, especially Chapter V on "Hellenism and the New Testament." See also W. R. Halliday's *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity*, and S. Angus' *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*. An older book is Carl Clemen's *Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources*.

[8] Fairweather, pp. 293-94.

tion of a heavenly commonwealth. The Greeks, we know, had formed the ideal of a world-embracing kingdom. 'The world is my country,' says Seneca; and again, 'Wherever a man is, there is room for doing good.' These ideas are appropriated by the apostle, and given a nobler content. 'Our citizenship,' he says, 'is in heaven.'"[9]

It appears that Paul dips his pen into Greek philosophy in Colossians 1:7 where he says that in Christ "all things consist," or "hold together." "The Son is the center of unity for the universe. He keeps all its parts in their proper place and due relations and combines them into an ordered whole. Apart from Him it would go to pieces. Philo ascribes a similar function to the Logos."[10] This is in line with the Greek philosophy of the divine immanence, that all things "live and move and have being in" God, so prevalent in Greek thought where it bordered on if it did not lose itself in pantheism. Paul keeps clear of this pit, but makes the gospel speak the same language.

A splendid instance of the principle of modernism and of its practice is seen in Paul's attitude towards and treatment of Greek religion in his address on Mars' Hill, to which we have already alluded. There he did not reject the Greek faith and did not even show disrespect to the idol in which it was embodied. On the contrary, he adopted the pagan idol as the text of his Christian sermon. "Ye men of Athens," he courteously began his speech, "in all things I perceive that ye are very religious. For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found an altar with this inscription, To an Unknown God." He did not deny their religion and despise its idol worship, which would have been bad psychology and at once have ended his acceptability with his audience, but adopted it and even complimented it. He said, in effect, that it was good as far as it went. Then came his tremendous modernistic application of his text: "What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth to you." He then proceeded to pour upon that poor dumb idol the light of the gospel and transformed it into a stepping-stone up into the glorious light of God as Creator and of "the Man . . . that he hath raised from

[9] Fairweather, pp. 299-300.
[10] *Expositor's Greek Testament*.

the dead." This was good psychology and logic and sound theology and it was nothing else than the principle of modernism in bringing old faith up into the light of new knowledge and adjusting the old and the new into broader truth and fuller life.

In thus tracing the presence and influence of Greek thought in the New Testament it is not meant that Greek ideas were imported bodily into Christian teaching so as to change its essential character, but only that Christianity manifested and exercised its affinity with all truth and absorbed and assimilated it wherever it found it. As Fairweather says, "Hellenism affected the structural form of Christianity, but not its essential content." Modernism does not destroy old truth or any truth, but only seeks to assimilate the old with the new.

We have thus seen that the current of modernism flowing through the Old Testament pours in a broadening stream through the New. The fact that the New Testament is new is itself an immense instance and illustration of this principle and process; and the principle is carried on through and progressively exemplified in the teaching of Jesus and in the life of the Apostolic church and in the New Testament writings. The whole Bible in principle and method and spirit is a modernistic book.

CHAPTER IX

THE PRINCIPLE OF MODERNISM IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Christianity finally completely freed itself from the old Judaism and set out on its independent course as a world religion. Small remnants of the Jewish Christians, such as the Ebionites and the Nazarenes, lingered, but the future was not with them and after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. they soon disappeared.[1]

The same epochal destruction also expelled Christianity from its native country and drove it out into foreign lands, where, however, it had already been pushing out and gaining some foothold in Apostolic missions. It now found itself thrust out into new conditions in which it had to speak strange tongues, conform to foreign laws and customs and pour itself into the molds of new thought-terms. Especially it found itself in contact with a swarm of Oriental religions and Greek philosophies and Roman laws where it had to guard itself from corruption and fight for its faith and yet also had in some degree to adapt itself to the new conditions and correlate its old faith with the culture of its time.

In the meantime it was only finding itself and getting on its own feet. It started with no church organization and formed new offices as the emergency for them arose, secreting its bony skeleton out of its inner nature as shellfish secrete their shells. It began to crystallize its inchoate beliefs, at first expressing them in such proverbial "faithful sayings" as that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," and condensing them into the baptismal formula and the triune benediction, which were the earliest germs of Christian creeds and were presently expanded into the Apostles' Creed, the earliest Christian symbol.

[1] For "The Christianity of the Jewish Christians," see Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* Chapter VI.

But all the while it was in contact and often in conflict with the pagan faiths and cults, resisting them and yet shaping itself by the very process of opposing them, and being affected by them still more deeply by absorbing and assimilating many of their ideas and practices and much of their spirit. The process, which we have been tracing through the Bible, by which the old faith constantly adjusted itself to and incorporated into itself the new knowledge and experience of its day, was again in operation and has come down through the Christian centuries to our time. It is now in order to trace this principle in the history of the Christian church after it passed out of the stage of the Apostolic church. This subject is vast as it involves the whole of church history during these nineteen centuries, and it will be possible in our space and sufficient for our purpose only to pick out a few critical points and set them in the light as illustrations of the principle of modernism we are studying.

1. Gnosticism

Gnosticism was a widespread pagan religion in the first and second Christian centuries having much in common with the Oriental mystery religions, the distinctive feature of which was that they were of the nature of secret societies with secret doctrines and rites communicated only to their initiates and thus were private religions appealing to individuals; whereas public religions, like Christianity, were open in their doctrines and rites and appealed to communities and nations and the world. Gnosticism probably originated in Persia and was based on the fundamental dualism of spirit and matter, or light and darkness, in eternal conflict. It therefore held that matter is essentially evil, and that spirit mysteriously fell into and became entangled with matter, which fall is the cause of all the confusion and misery of the world. Redemption consists in a process of rescue from this fallen state and ascent through stages into pure spirit or light. God is the Supreme Power from which issue successive "æons" or demiurges or lower deities who create the world and redeem entangled souls. The "gnosis," which is the Greek word for knowledge, designates the secret knowledge by which the initiate effects his deliverance, and this

"gnosis" is of the nature of intuition, vision, ecstasy and supernatural revelation.[2]

The system assumed various forms in different countries and under different leaders, but these ideas were common to all its branches. It has some obvious points of connection with Christianity, as it is a religion of fall and redemption, and some of the Gnostics seized upon these points of similarity and effected a degree of fusion or cohesion between the two faiths. They were mostly Greeks and applied their intellectual and philosophical powers to rationalizing Gnosticism and Christianity into synthesis. Some Christian theologians also found some affinity between the two faiths and fused them into a degree of coherency. "The Gnostics," says Harnack, "were the theologians of the 1st century; they were the first to transform Christianity into a system of doctrines (dogmas); they were the first to treat tradition and the primitive Christian Scriptures systematically; they undertook to set forth Christianity as the absolute religion, and they therefore placed it in opposition to the other religions, to that of the Old Testament as well (not alone to Judaism); but the absolute religion, which they coupled with Christ, was to them essentially identical with the results of the philosophy of religion, for which they had now found the basis in a revelation. They were accordingly a class of Christians who essayed through a sharp onset to conquer Christianity for Hellenic culture, and Hellenic culture for Christianity, and they thereby abandoned the Old Testament in order to fitly close up the breach between the two opposing forces. Christianity thus became an occult philosophy (revealed metaphysics and apparition philosophy, permeated with the Platonic spirit and with Pauline ideas)."[3]

It was soon discerned, however, that Christianity and Gnosticism were in fundamental antagonism. The supreme God of Gnosticism was an impersonal and impassive Fate, its demiurge Saviour was

---

[2] For a detailed history of Gnosticism, see Harnack's *History of Christian Dogma*, 8 volumes, vol. 1. Also his *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, Part I, Book I, Chapter IV. An elaborate and informing account of the system is found in the article on "*Gnosticism*" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

[3] Harnack, *Outlines*, p. 60.

only a secondary emanation caught in the same coils, and human souls were only fitful gleams and sparks. The vital breath of Christianity would be smothered and squeezed out of it by this iron constriction. Christian theology could not possibly live under the same roof with Persian mythology. Christianity then set itself against Gnosticism with destructive logic and life and drove it from the field so that by the end of the second century it was on the decline and passed on to its extinction.

Nevertheless, we can see that Christianity and Gnosticism were both unconsciously following the principle of modernism, for both were trying to harmonize and unify their total knowledge and experience, each selecting from the other the elements that it thought true and incorporating them in its own system. And thus both of them emerged from this process somewhat different from what they were before they met, and in some measure modified each other.

In particular, Christianity underwent modifications in this process. The conflict forced it to a more definite statement of its doctrines and thus started the church on the road of creed-making. It had to forge and sharpen its defensive and offensive weapons and this forced it to study its own history and Scriptures. The conflict hastened the formation of the New Testament canon. It emphasized the need of efficient church organization and developed the eldership into episcopacy and helped to generate the Catholic idea and ideal that reached its climax in Rome. It strengthened the tendency to Christian asceticism in opposition to Gnostic libertinism, poured into Christianity a richer strain of mysticism, perhaps contributing something to the mystical atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel, intensified the sacramental side of the gospel, and stimulated among Christian scholars the spirit of theological research, as the Gnostic teachers were men of philosophical mind, and thus foreshadowed modern criticism.

In these and other points Christianity sought to disarm and displace Gnosticism by offering better Christian for Gnostic forms, taking Gnostic ideas and deepening and enriching them out of its own deeper and richer life. At every point Christianity showed itself a truer and more satisfying religion than Gnosticism and thus expelled it by the expulsive power of a better faith.

We can find some traces of Gnostic influences in the New Testament. Paul was not immune to this influence and his catholic sympathies and absorptive soul assimilated more from it than we can detect. In Colossians, the most philosophical as Romans is the most theological of his Epistles, his teaching (1:16) that Christ is the creator of things "in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers" exalts him over these Gnostic "æons" and "demiurges"; and in Ephesians (6:12) he may be referring to these Gnostic lower deities when he urges Christians to put on the whole armor of God "against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." And when in the same chapter (19) he speaks of "the mystery of the Gospel" he may be suggesting and offering a better "mystery" than that of Gnosticism.

The false teachers who are condemned in Colossians seem to belong to a variety of Jewish Gnosticism. The heresies contemplated in the pastoral Epistles and in the messages to the Churches in Revelation are even more evidently of a Gnostic type. The Fourth Gospel rests upon the thesis that "the Word was made flesh"; and, in view of the close relation between the Fourth Gospel and the 1st Epistle of John, there can be little doubt that the writer is opposing some form of Gnostic docetism. It is the peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel that its underlying polemic against the Gnostic teaching is combined with a certain sympathy.[4]

Thus Christianity took some shape and color, form and spirit from the very system it was opposing. It was selecting any truth and good it found in the pagan cults and incorporating it in its own gospel. It was gathering into itself all the truth of its day, winnowing out the wheat and rejecting the chaff, and seeking to unify its total experience. The first Christian missionaries and theologians endeavored to clothe their gospel in the ideas and imagery of pagan religions and thus brought them home to their pagan hearers and converts. With Paul at Athens they adopted and then adapted pagan forms so as to make them express and convey the gospel in the thought-terms of their time. They were

[4] E. F. Scott in the article on "Gnosticism" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*

true though unconscious modernists in their day, bringing their religion up to date and progressively unifying their total experience in thought and life.

2. The Church Fathers

The Church Fathers were Christian scholars and leaders, during the second, third, fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era, who defended Christianity in its conflicts with paganism and adapted it to the intellectual and political conditions of their time. Leading Greek Fathers were Clement of Rome (150-215), head of the catechetical school in Alexandria and teacher of Origen. Origen (182-251) of Alexandria, who became Presbyter of Cæsarea and wrote voluminous works, including a treatise *Against Celsus*, the first philosophical opponent of Christianity. Athanasius (293-373), Bishop of Alexandria and opponent of Arius, the first great heretic in the Christian church. Chrysostom (344-407), Patriarch of Constantinople, the golden-mouthed preacher of his day. Leading Latin Fathers were Tertullian (155-222), a lawyer of Carthage and founder of early Christian literature, remarkably keen and brilliant but sometimes bitter in controversy. Jerome (340-420), great scholar and editor of the Latin Vulgate. Ambrose (340-397), Bishop of Milan under whose preaching Augustine was converted. Augustine (354-430), lawyer of Carthage, who became the most powerful theologian and defender of the faith in the ancient church and whose *Confessions* and *City of God* are Christian classics that are yet read. These and other scholars and writers did valiant service in defending Christianity and adjusting it to their time.

When Christianity pushed out into the Greco-Roman world it found itself in a new climate. The Greek climate was that of philosophy and science. Plato and Aristotle ruled that world from their mighty urns and the spell of their spirit was everywhere in the air. The Hebrew mind was neither philosophical nor scientific, but religious and mystical. The Greeks with their intellectual genius that has never been surpassed, if equaled, had developed a large body of philosophic speculation and scientific observation which is the foundation of our modern knowledge. They studied nature to observe and classify its facts and deduce its laws and reach rational explanations of its events; and they had speculated profoundly on the deeper problems of the cause of the world, the nature of man and the existence of God. They had thus thrown upon the world a light of explanation and speculation that was

unfriendly to superstitious pagan religions and these were dying in its pitiless exposure.

Christianity, emerging out of its provincial unscientific Hebrew heredity and environment and seclusion, found itself face to face with this world of philosophy and science and soon discovered that it must take account of it, both to reject and resist its errors and to accept and incorporate in its own system its elements of truth. The situation was wonderfully like the relation of religion to science in the nineteenth century when Christian faith was confronted with the results and spirit of modern science and had to adjust itself to them at whatever cost of compromise. This process and battle has been going on through all the Christian centuries, but it assumes special forms and grows acute at certain periods, and as it passed through a crisis in the nineteenth so did it in the second and third centuries.

The Greek Fathers undertook this work and successfully negotiated the transition according to their lights. They were imbued with the Greek spirit of philosophic insight and scientific reasoning and endeavored to amalgamate their Christian doctrines and their Greek ideas into harmony and unity. Greek ideas of divine immanence bordering on pantheism were interfused with Hebrew ideas of divine sovereignty resulting in a concept of God more complex than the monotheism of the Old Testament and affording room for and affinity with the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. All the doctrines of Christianity were thrown into the mill of Greek philosophy and science and came out in a somewhat different shape and texture. The detailed account of these conflicts and adjustments and the way they were worked out by different Greek Fathers can be found in histories of Christian doctrine.

Great discussions and heated controversies arose over these highly abstract problems and the streets of Alexandria, where clashed the followers of Athanasius and of Arius, rang with violent debates or were crowded with turbulent mobs shouting for one or the other side. These controversies precipitated great councils, notably that of Nicæa in 325, where the opposing theories and groups came to grips, and while imperial soldiers maintained order epochal decisions were made.

The Latin Fathers lived in a somewhat different world and

encountered other problems from that of the Greek theologians. They were immediately under the shadow of the Roman Empire and breathed its atmosphere. Their ideas and problems were those of authority and law, polity and administration. They were lawyers and orators rather than philosophers and poets, practical doers rather than abstract thinkers. They handled the case of Christianity at the bar of Rome as legal advocates rather than as rhetoricians. They followed the methods and spirit of the Roman Forum rather than of the Greek Academy. They were more interested in polity than in doctrine and were more concerned in building a church organization on the foundation and pattern of the Empire than in framing a system of theology. Augustine in the West, however, was an exception as he was not only a builder of the church but also a theologian who left his impress on our theology to this city. "The course of Christian theology has been affected in a very remarkable manner by the difference of the Greek and the Latin mind. The first was speculative and consequently metaphysical; the second was practical and as a result ethical or legal. The doctrine of the person of Christ as dogmatically formulated is the product of the Greek genius. The Roman ethos restored to prominence in the thought of the Church, and gave its character to what was thought about the work of Christ. There is a Greek and a Latin type of theology clearly distinguishable, since these differences between the Greek and the Latin mind do correspond to diverging tendencies of human interest and activity."[5]

This process of meeting existing conditions and adjusting the old faith to new culture are inevitable and inescapable. Christianity had to make this adjustment or perish along with the pagan cults that refused to and could not do it. "The Fathers could not help themselves; the terms were there, and they must speak in the language of their people and day and school. But to use the language was to admit the thought; to translate their beliefs into the formulæ of the schools, translated in matter as well as in form. The matter construed was not the old scholastic matter, and so the new definitions and theorems were not identical with the old. . . . What entered the speculative Greek intellect a religion and

[5] Alfred E. Garvie, *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, p. 121.

a history came out a theology, as much a creation of the metaphysical mind as if the place had been an academy or a school instead of a council."[6]

We thus see that the Church Fathers were endeavoring to work their Hebrew faith and Greek ideas and Roman ideals into harmony and unity. That they did not always reach the truth in their results and incorporated in Christianity some incongruous Greek ideas[7] and overloaded it with Roman imperial ideals that burdened and hindered Christianity and cling as fetters to it to this day, is to be freely admitted. Especially did the Latin Fathers lay the foundations of Roman Catholicism and helped to Romanize Christianity as well as to Christianize Rome. All this is quite in accordance with the principle and method of modernism. It does not always attain truth in its adjustments. It may incorporate and often has incorporated error as well as truth. Modernism in itself is no guarantee of truth and insurance against error, as we have already noted. But it is an attempt to reach larger truth in unified knowledge and experience. This the Church Fathers did with such success as they were able to achieve. They saw that they could not hold the old faith unless they could correlate it with the new culture which was so fatal to the dying pagan faiths. And so the Church Fathers also were modernists in their day.

3. The Ancient Councils and Creeds

A council is the result of an accumulated strain in the faith and life of the church which threatens disruption and finds adjustment and relief in a creed that endeavors to unify its advanced knowledge and experience in an up-to-date expression. It is a critical point in the life of religion illustrating the working of the principle of modernism.

This principle and process is perfectly exemplified in the first

[6] A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 89. This work is a learned and masterly discussion of the principle and process we are tracing.

[7] "The taking over of this philosophical idea (of the Logos) has not been by any means an unmixed blessing to the Christian Church." Dr. A. E. Garvie in *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, p. 118.

two councils in Jerusalem with reference to the Gentiles. The point at issue, as we have seen, was the relation of the Gentile converts to the Christian church. At first all the Christians were Jews and supposed that Christianity was only a fulfilled Judaism. But soon the question arose as to the admission of the Gentiles, dividing the church into conservatives and liberals and producing a strain that threatened disruption. The first council adjusted the situation by admitting the Gentiles along with the Jews, and this was a wide step forward and was itself an epochal instance of modernism. The question, however, was deep-seated and arose again a few years later in the form of the demand of the conservatives or Judaizers that the Gentile converts be subjected to the Mosaic rites, and this opened the old cleavage and precipitated another council. This resulted in a decree which was the first ecumenical decision and creed of the church. It again negotiated the crisis by another forward step. A compromise decision or creed was adopted which released the Gentile converts from the most oppressive of the Mosaic rites and retained some minor ones in the form of advice while not relaxing the moral law. This again relieved the strain and the faith and life of the church were again brought up to date and flowed in one smooth channel. Modernism was again exemplified.

The same principle runs down through all the councils and creeds of the church to this day. We need refer only briefly in this place to the early councils and creeds illustrating the process.

The first great critical issue in the post-Apostolic church arose in the fourth century in the conflict between Athanasius and Arius over the fundamental doctrine of the person of Christ. Athanasius (293-373), Bishop of Alexandria, took the position that Christ was of the same substance with the Father and thereby held to his proper deity. Arius (256-336), a presbyter in Alexandria, held that Christ was only of a similar substance with the Father and thereby reduced him to the rank of a creature, though the highest. These two views spread and gathered followers and debate ran high. Alexandria itself, the leading university city and seat of Christianity of the day, became the burning center of the controversy which grew into a furious popular and political issue. The church was severely strained from center to circumference and

grave consequences were impending. The result was the Council of Nicæa in 325 A. D., where amidst much excitement and heat the rival doctrines and parties clashed and the outcome was the Nicene Creed declaring that Christ is of the same substance with the Father, "very God of very God." This saved the church from the Arian heresy that would have reduced Christ to a creature, dethroned him as the Saviour of men and relegated Christianity to pass into and perish with the pagan mythologies.

Arius impaired the divine consubstantial nature of Christ, but Apollinaris (310-390), Bishop of Laodicea, impaired the complete humanity of Christ by substituting in his person the divine Spirit for the human reason. This endangered Christianity from an opposite point of attack from that of Arius and again developed a strain in the church. The First Council of Constantinople (381) met this issue by restating in a fuller and more emphatic form the position of Nicæa and condemned Apollinaris, and again the strain was relieved.

There were seven of these early councils that are regarded as ecumenical and are accepted by all branches of Christianity, Greek, Roman Catholic and Protestant. Among the more important of these, after Nicæa and Constantinople, were the Council of Ephesus (431), which condemned the heresy of Eutyches, a presbyter of Constantinople, who fused the two natures of Christ into a third substance neither human nor divine, and the Council of Chalcedon (451), which condemned the heresy of Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who joined the two natures in a moral union and thereby impaired the unity of the person. The Chalcedonian creed practically marked the end of the development and statement of the doctrine of the person of Christ, which has come down to us in the creeds of our day.

Sufficient has been said to illustrate our point and purpose, which is not to give an account of these councils but only to show that each one of them arose out of the conditions of the time in which an accumulated strain had developed, and the council was a means of adjusting and the creed of expressing the solution. In each case the council with the creed was a forward step, bringing the old faith up into harmony with new knowledge and experience. Even when an error was condemned some element of truth in it was

incorporated in the new creed, and the very fact of the adjustment did not leave the faith of the church where it had been but modified it and brought it forward into closer relation with the knowledge and experience of its time. This was modernism in its day.

4. Scholasticism

In passing from the period of the ancient church, extending from the second to the fifth century, to the scholasticism or intellectual system of the Middle Ages, extending from the ninth to the fifteenth century, we again find ourselves in a new world with a different climate. The scene of affairs has passed from the East to the West. The Roman Empire has vanished from its mighty stage, leaving majestic ruins to testify to its greatness and its grandeur. It fell with a tremendous world-shaking crash, and its vast rim was broken into pieces that formed the modern nations of Europe. In its place we find the Roman Catholic Church, in the striking metaphor of Hobbes, "sitting as its ghost on its grave." Rome was now the seat of its authority but not of its learning. Learning has always fought shy of political capitals and seats of authority, and rarely do we find them in the same center. Learning is solicitous about the interference of authority, and authority is suspicious of the critical spirit of learning. And so the two prefer to remain at a respectful distance. When Rome was mistress of the world, the university centers were Athens and Alexandria. And when political authority deserted Rome but ecclesiastical domination set up its throne there in a more rigid discipline and despotism, learning went north and settled in Paris and Cologne and London. And when London became a controlling capital, then learning withdrew to Oxford and Cambridge, Glasgow and Edinburgh. The old division of the Roman world into East and West was replaced by another division running at right angles to the former one and dividing the Western world into northern and southern regions.

It was the time of feudalism when barons ruled their peasants and only loosely served their kings, while kings held their crowns precariously by the authority, or at least with the sanction, of the pope. Church organization had crystallized into a complex and

rigid system and gripped the whole life of the people, religious and civil.

This did not seem to leave room for much intellectual liberty and life with which we are chiefly concerned. It was, indeed, in no small degree restricted and standardized by the creeds and especially by the authority of the church. And yet the time was not at all one of intellectual stagnation and death. Powerful minds were alive and alert to discuss philosophical and religious problems and under the surface there was going on a penetrating fermentation that prepared the way for the new and open liberty and life of the coming age.

There are great names that shine out in this time, the "schoolmen" that gave the name to the period, and our space and purpose will permit only a brief reference to several of them and their problems. Their problems were chiefly three: the relation of faith to reason, or of religion and science, the problem that runs through this book; the problem of theological doctrines, especially the work of Christ in his atonement; and the philosophical problem of the relation of names to their objects, or of realism and nominalism. We shall pass by the third problem as having little relation to our subject.

Three names stand out conspicuous in the discussion of the first two problems: Anselm (1033-1109), Archbishop of Canterbury; Abélard (1079-1142), a French scholastic philosopher and theologian, and Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274), Italian theologian. Their handling of the problem of the relation of reason and faith was remarkably like the present-day discussion of the same problem and they were true modernists and forerunners of to-day.

Anselm asserted the fundamental unity of reason and faith but sought for an adjustment of the superficial differences and apparent antagonisms, which is exactly our problem. The question of prime importance with these scholastics was, Which comes first in order, reason or faith? Anselm answered this question one way, and Abélard the other. Anselm put reason first because it must pass upon the form and validity of the contents of faith, and thus he was a rationalist. Abélard put faith first as being the instinctive and traditional belief with which we start, and thus he was a mystic; but he allowed that when reason emerges faith must be

criticized by it and come into agreement with it. They were both right from the modern point of view. Faith comes first chronologically and reason first logically. We still begin with traditional faith, but we proceed to criticize it when the mind overtakes the heart in the process of development. And reason has the final word, for it more surely reaches reality than does feeling and is the rock on which we rest. "They thus differed," says Fairbairn, "as regards the sequence or relative priority of faith and reason, but not as regards their ultimate harmony. Without this harmony neither faith nor reason could be satisfied; were they to remain in conflict, either the one or the other must be sacrificed, and the sacrifice of either would be the sacrifice of something directly created and sanctioned of God. . . . Beneath, therefore, the difference as to the order or sequence of the acts, there was agreement as to their equal necessity and validity." [8]

Aquinas was also a rationalist but more of an eclectic than Anselm and Abélard. He restored Aristotle to a dominant place in the thinking of the schoolmen, and Greek philosophy was again enlisted to rationalize Christian doctrines. Yet he drove a divisive line between natural theology, which can demonstrate such truths as God's existence and man's ethical duty, and the higher truths of revelation, such as the Trinity, incarnation, sacraments and eschatology, averring that the most reason can do in relation to these is to show that they are not contradictory to reason. Aquinas, though he was suspected in his day of "rationalism," or, as we would say, of "modernism," yet in time became the ruling intellect in Roman Catholic thought and shaped the theology of this church to this day.

The doctrinal problem that engaged the thought of the schoolmen was the atonement. The person of Christ was the first great central problem that arose in the Christian church and this was practically settled in the councils and creeds of the early church. The work of Christ now came forward into the center of the scene and theories and parties grew rife around it. The theory of the atonement that had come down from the ancient church was that the death of Christ was the price God paid to the devil as a ransom

[8] *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 120.

to release his hold on fallen man. This theory was carried to the crassest absurdity, such as the statement of Peter the Lombard (1100-1160) who went the length of saying that the cross of Christ was a mouse-trap baited with his blood to catch the devil. This crude theory ruled the church for a thousand years and yet it contained some truth, even the truth of redemption. People were saved by it though such a coarse caricature of the full truth seems to show that theories of the atonement are less important than we may think and we should hesitate to classify and divide Christian men by means of any such line.

Anselm flatly rejected this ancient view and wrote an epochal book, entitled *Cui Deus Homo,* that still holds a place in the literature of this doctrine. He held that man's sin was an infinite affront to the honor of God that called for an infinite satisfaction. Therefore, God became man in Christ that he might offer a sacrifice that came from man and yet had divine worth. The honor of God having been thus vindicated, man was set free. This doctrine was a great advance on the devil theory and stated the truth in terms that approach our own views of it. Yet it is evident that it bears the marks of the feudal age in which it grew with its sense of feudal honor that could be satisfied only on the field of mortal combat. Even so, it was stating the doctrine in the terms of the thought and experience of its own day, which is the principle of modernism.

Abélard's view differed widely from Anselm's in that he emphasized the ethical element in the atonement and made its virtue to consist in its moral influence on man; and thus he was the first definitely to teach a moral influence theory of this doctrine.

We need not further pursue the problems and views of the schoolmen as we have seen enough to disclose the principle of modernism on which they were proceeding. They found themselves in a highly traditionalized world in which Christian doctrines were accepted as they had come down cast and crystallized in the molds of other days. Ecclesiastical authority was regnant and it was dangerous to differ. Yet differences could not be kept down and the human mind could not be rigidly bound. Fetters might be placed on outer words but not on inner thinking. And even the inner reasoning and most secret thoughts found ways of

expressing themselves outwardly in forms that escaped detection and prohibition. The schoolmen were under the necessity of rethinking the traditional doctrines and bringing the old faith into conformity with the new reasoning principles and processes. They also were endeavoring to unify their total knowledge and experience. And so they were modernists in their day and bore a singular likeness to the modernists of our day.

5. The Renaissance

The Renaissance was the springtime of our modern world, the transition from the winter of the Middle Ages to the summer of our own time. Its limits can only be broadly defined as like all seasonal changes it was gradual, the winter of the Middle Ages gently and insensibly warming into the sunshine and budding life of spring. But its period fell mainly within the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

It was a complex movement growing out of a convergence of causes and dividing into various forms and phases. It was in effect a powerful outburst of human ability and creative energy, transforming the European world as spring transforms the earth, and is comparable to the outflowering of genius in Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. The causes of such crises and climaxes are obscure and they come and go as if independent of human agency with the irresistibleness of spring and other cosmic changes.

Like the spring also the Renaissance started in the south and moved north, everywhere creating a new world and awakening new seeds into bloom as it developed in sunny Italy and moved north across the Alps into western and northern Europe. It broke up the medieval crust of Europe and prepared the way for new sowing and reaping. What a wonderful period it was! We think of our modern times, especially the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as unparalleled for revolutionary and brilliant and astounding discoveries and progress, but this may be because we forget or fail to realize the break-up of the old world and the birth of the new in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The inventions of the mariner's compass, gunpowder, paper and printing, the displacement of the pitifully small Ptolemaic heavens with the infinitely grander

and profoundly revolutionizing Copernican astronomy, the fall of Constantinople into the hands of the Turks with the result of shifting the center of Europe from the East to the West and especially of driving scholars and learning into the West, the tremendous and immensely sensational and revolutionary event of the discovery of America, the Revival of Learning, the decline of the papacy into impotency, the fall of feudalism, the revolt against despotism in church and state, the sprouting of early seeds of democracy, the decline in authority of dogmatic orthodoxy and the birth of the critical spirit, the beginnings of inductive science and the laying of the foundations of our modern scientific knowledge of the universe, the new sense of the worth and rights of man, the new appreciation of nature and art and the outflowering of architecture and painting and poetry and music, a new spontaneity and exuberance and freedom and joy in all things human,—the whole European world was astir and abloom as is the earth when it awakens out of winter into spring. It was as though man had acquired a new sense of the meaning and beauty of the world and the joy of life.

The Renaissance began in Italy in the thirteenth century with the discovery of the background of the old Roman Empire whose majestic ruins lay exposed before men's eyes like the huge bones of some prehistoric animal but to which they had long been strangely insensible. They began to study these ruins and caught a vision of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome," and began to dream of restoring them. Architecture got a start and grew rapidly. Art in general, especially painting and sculpture, began to bud and in the fourteenth century bloomed into the glories of Michelangelo and da Vinci and Raphael. The appearance of the classical scholars from Constantinople bringing with them their manuscripts opened to them the glories of classical literature, and Plato and Aristotle arose out of their ancient tombs and taught again in Rome and Florence and Milan. This led to the Revival of Learning, one aspect of the Renaissance, that gave a fresh impetus to the whole movement. Another aspect of the movement was the Humanism that opened a new interest in man and human life as the soil out of which all literature and art spring. Italy thus began to swarm with archeologists, scholars, architects,

painters, sculptors, poets, romanticists, and the country became vocal with their music as the song of birds fills the spring.

The Renaissance in Italy, however, had little effect on the church and religion, which was in no degree reformed by it but rather was intensified by the new life only on its secular side, resulting in splendid architecture and art, pageantry and pomp in its outward forms, but in no quickening in its inner life and spirituality; rather did it obscure and smother its spiritual life and even tended towards increased worldliness and sensuality.

As the Renaissance moved north across the Alps it took on a different aspect. As less luxuriant but more hardy plants grow in the northern zone, so the Renaissance in northern Europe produced a more serious ethical life. It ran less to art and secular learning and more to religious study and life. Erasmus (1466-1536) in Holland, Reuchlin (1455-1522) in Germany, and Zwingli (1481-1521) in Switzerland were leaders in Humanism in the North. These men revived the study of Greek and Latin and of the Church Fathers, but their chief interest was in the Greek New Testament. The ablest and most influential of these was Erasmus, who, while remaining in the Roman Catholic Church, yet shot polished shafts of wit and sarcasm and ridicule at its follies and corruptions and excited revolt against it and prepared the way for its reformation. Especially was he unsparing in exposing the ceremonial show and sham of the Roman Church. "In language of appalling plainness he described the obfuscation of conscience by the ceremonies; they abrogated the law of God, caused disrespect and disobedience to the most rudimentary, yet imperative, moral laws, blinded and blunted the moral sense, created an artificial and utterly unveracious conscience in persons, orders, and even whole communities. No man had ever less of the Puritan temper than Erasmus; but no man so helps us to understand the need for the Puritan spirit and character."[9]

The greatest literary work of Erasmus was his annotated edition of the Greek New Testament that brought men into immediate contact with the original record and primitive form of Christianity and opened their eyes to its purity and simplicity and showed how

[9] Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 136.

far Roman Christianity had departed from this original simplicity and pure morality into the appalling hollow pageantry and immorality that then prevailed.

The outcome of the Renaissance as it affected Christianity was that it brought the church to the bar of judgment and called all its creeds and institutions to account. The new knowledge and spirit, that was like the breath of spring to all things else, could not be kept out of the church but invaded and pervaded it and began to dissolve its medieval forms and bonds. Christianity could not stand aloof and keep itself immune from the change of climate that was creeping over all Western Europe and waking it out of winter into spring. It, too, had to submit to the process of reforming the old and conforming to the new in order to save its life and live in the new world. This profound change was more fully effected in the Reformation, which was the chief outcome and final phase of the Renaissance, but already it has been seen that the new life of the age carried in its bosom the principles and seeds of modernism. Christianity had to adjust itself to growing knowledge and light and keep abreast of its age, and this process is what modernism is.

6. The Reformation

Spring brings storms. The changing temperature creates areas of unequal pressure with resulting winds and clouds and electric strain that issue in a storm with discharge of lightning and downpour of rain that relieve the electric tension and restore climatic balance. Such a storm may be accompanied with destructive winds and floods and leave wide devastation in its track. Yet it also leaves fresher air and greener fields and bluer skies, a smiling and more fruitful earth.

The Reformation was such a storm. Conditions of strain had long been accumulating, the spring of the Renaissance released these and precipitated a storm that reverberated widely over Europe and did much damage to its social fabric, but was also a means of a new and better world.

The Reformation was not simply a religious, but was also a political and economic, event. The state of the Roman Catholic Church was a primary condition of this epochal upheaval, but not

the only cause. Rome was a gigantic religious and political despotism, the ghost of the Roman Empire, as Hobbes said, sitting on its grave. It gripped the whole life of the Middle Ages in both church and state. In fact, the two had been fused into one. The pope claimed to be the supreme Vicegerent of God in things secular as well as spiritual, and kings and emperors were often puppets in his hands; sometimes, however, it was the other way and he was a puppet in their hands. The Roman Church had reproduced to a startling degree of likeness and on a grander scale the later Judaism with its splendid Temple and gorgeous pageantry and hypocritical corrupt religion, outwardly white as a marble sepulchre but inwardly full of corruption. Ground down under this pitiless mass and weight of despotic power and worldliness and splendor groaned the oppressed peasantry as they suffered in enforced silence but were storing up wrath for the day of rebellion and destruction.

Martin Luther was the man for this hour, the spark that exploded this magazine, the electric flash that released the tension and precipitated the storm. He was a man with more emotional mass and might than intellectual discernment and logical power, stronger on the destructive than on the constructive side of his nature, a big rough man who could strike tremendous blows and was more intent on clearing evils out of the way and getting things done than cautious and considerate about the best things to be done and the wisest way of doing them; a man of dynamic energy who, once aroused, was a lion in strength and courage and wrath.

Already Humanism in northern Europe with its studies of the Greek New Testament and the Church Fathers had uncovered the long-hidden original records of Christianity and the simplicity and purity of the primitive church and men were beginning to see its broad and glaring contrast with the despotic, worldly and corrupt church of their day. Luther, an orthodox and submissive monk, had his eyes opened to the situation. Salvation by the rubbish of Roman works was displaced in his mind with salvation by justification by faith. His hour was now come.

The scandalous traffic in papal indulgences by an itinerant peddler in his neighborhood was only a trivial incident in the life of

Luther, a spark that started the fire. His action, once he was ready, was swift and decisive. He was then a professor of philosophy in the University of Wittenberg and on the memorable 31st of October, 1517, he nailed on the door of the Wittenberg church his ninety-five theses against indulgences, and every stroke of that hammer in time was heard through Europe and eventually around the world. Three years later he burned in the public square the Papal Bull excommunicating him and started a fire that is burning to this day.

We are not concerned to follow the story of his stormy dramatic career to its triumphant close, but he severed as with a sword the greater part of northern Europe from the power of the papacy and created Protestantism. Other men, of course, wrought in the same cause. Calvin at Geneva did a work of deeper and more lasting importance than that of Luther. If Luther was the mighty emotional heart of the Reformation, Calvin was its brain. These men so widely different in endowment and temperament yet singularly complemented each other in this epochal event. Luther started the fire that generated the energy of the Reformation, but Calvin forged the doctrinal system that was its logical foundation and lasting framework. Luther was a doer, but Calvin was a thinker, and the two together wrought this great revolution in the religious world and have flung their shadows down upon us.

The Reformation, like a storm, was not all orderly and constructive but in a degree was chaotic and destructive. At once it became mixed with the politics of the day, kings and princes took a hand in it and its track was bathed in blood. The peasantry seized the opportunity of the occasion to rise in a terrible insurrection, in which they received no sympathy and help from Luther. While the Reformation in the main was a rebellion against the despotism of the papacy and the scandals of the church, a return to the simplicity and purity of primitive Christianity and an assertion of the right of private judgment and the freedom of the individual conscience, yet it sowed the seeds of a despotism of its own, substituting for the infallibility of the pope the infallibility of its own dogmas and forging new fetters that long restricted freedom of conscience in the church. It had little sympathy with the spirit

of modern inquiry and with the rights of the common people and contributed little towards the rise of modern democracy.

Nevertheless, with all its failures and shortcomings due to the conditions of the time, these men wrought valiantly for us and we are entered into their labors. When the storm of the Reformation subsided, it left a purer atmosphere and the seeds of a fairer world. Southern Europe was little affected by it, as it is to this day, but northern Europe was almost wholly torn loose from Rome and set free to develop its own religious and civil liberty and life.

Our concern with this epochal event is its relation to the principle of modernism. Did it have anything to do with this principle? Was it not a retrogression to primitive Christianity and, therefore, a current counter to modernism? It was largely a reversion, but it was also something more. Besides, modernism may go backward for new light as well as forward. We are constantly doing this in every field of knowledge with the historian's pen and the archeologist's spade. Modernism is in each day the unification of all its knowledge, whether it comes out of the past or is discovered in the present.

The new knowledge of the Renaissance was a powerful cause of the Reformation. It shed a broad light and a dissolving heat upon the world that began to make all things new. The new astronomy especially was a revolutionizing piece of knowledge that threw much of the old knowledge and the old faith into the melting-pot to be recast in larger and truer forms. The Bible, when dragged out of the obscurity in which it had been hidden, let loose a flood of fresh knowledge about Christianity, and the book itself was necessarily read in the light of the new knowledge of the day. The Reformers thus went to school along with the Humanists and they, too, lived in this springtime when the sun of truth was shining with clearer and warmer rays. What they were doing, however unconsciously, was attempting to unify their total knowledge and experience, the new with the old, the new knowledge of scientific and literary progress with the old faith of tradition. This process was working in the background and at the root of the whole tremendous upheaval of the Reformation, and this is the principle and process of modernism.

7. The Modern Churches

There is a remarkable parallel between the Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic Church: the one passed away and the other came into its place, in no small degree passing through the same phases and repeating its history. The Roman Empire divided into East and West, and the Roman Catholic Church divided into the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic churches. Next, the Roman Empire in the West fell with a mighty crash and its great fragments became the modern nations of Europe. In a similar way the Roman Catholic Church fell apart and its fragments in northern Europe became the Protestant churches. The Roman Church developed the despotic and political form and spirit of the Roman Empire, and it still claims world-wide dominion though it is no more than the pale ghost of its mighty ancestor.

It was the immeasurable and irreparable tragedy of Protestantism that it did not cohere into unity and present a solid front to the Roman Catholic Church and to the world; but it lacked this power of coherence and has broken into hundreds of bodies ranging in size from very small sects with only a handful of members and perhaps a single congregation to large national churches and denominations with millions of adherents. The same seeds of division that separated Protestantism from Rome remained in its own bosom to divide itself into many separatist bodies which are still dividing. This charge has been brought by Roman Catholics against Protestants, and the charge is true. Division is not only still going on, but it is about as hard and hopeless a problem as ever to get any two or more of them to unite. This is the greatest weakness of Protestantism and there is little sign as yet that it may be overcome, though a step in this direction was accomplished (August, 1927) at the Lausanne World Conference on Faith and Order.

Christianity to-day is divided into the Eastern Greek Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the various Protestant churches. Of these the principal branches with their original seats are the Lutheran and the Reformed in Germany and Switzerland, the Anglican in England, the Presbyterian in Scotland, and the Baptist, Congregational, and Methodist churches as they originated in England. All these churches have been transplanted to North

America and are very strong in the United States. The Roman Catholic Church has almost exclusive possession of South America,[10] and all these churches have planted themselves around the world in foreign missions. Modernism has had much to do with founding and shaping all these churches. They all and each tried to follow and express, embody and propagate their sense of truth and experience in its totality and coherency, and this is the principle of modernism.

The Roman Catholic Church itself has been far from immune from the spirit and process of modernism. Protestants need to revise several of their traditional notions of the Roman Catholic Church: that it never changes; that it is wholly corrupt and apostate and is the "antichrist," "man of sin," and "the woman upon a scarlet colored beast," "the mother of harlots drunken with the blood of the saints," of John's writings; in short, that it is not a church and is not Christian. This view has been quietly erased from some of our Protestant creeds, as from the Westminster Confession, and is passing from all Protestant circles. The whole history of the Roman Catholic Church prior to the Reformation belongs to us all and she must be acknowledged as our mother church. It has a glorious roll of apostles, martyrs, missionaries, saints, that are our common heritage. And it has always had men of light and leading in its communion to this day.

The Roman Catholic Church inescapably felt the ameliorating influences of the Renaissance, and the Reformation itself reacted upon it with good results. It was made aware of the gravity of its conditions and of the need of reform and it set about cleaning its own house. It developed the Counter-Reformation which was a deep and powerful movement culminating in the Council of Trent (1545-1563), which was held for the express object of correcting the abuses which had brought on the Reformation. It adopted various "reformatory decrees" providing for specific reforms. "So thorough and far-reaching was the reformatory work of the Council of Trent that the church has since that time done little more than apply and enforce its decrees, which, with slight modifica-

[10] "In the twenty Latin-American republics, whose combined population in 1923 was 98,100,000, there were 226,702 (Protestant) communicants, or less than one-quarter of one per cent." *Universal Knowledge,* Vol. I, page 714.

tion, are still in force."[11] The Roman Catholic Church is still subject to the influence of progress in knowledge and from time to time moves up to or permits scientific doctrines, such as the Copernican astronomy, which it once proscribed. This work is still quietly going on and occasionally breaks out in individual teachings or local movements which may be frowned upon or prohibited by church authority. But such fermentation cannot be stopped or wholly suppressed and is surely working underneath the surface. Books are still printed and are read by Roman Catholics, the spirit of modernism is in the very air, and more or less consciously they imbibe its principles and incorporate its results in their thinking. They have many great scholars and brilliant literary men and in general they must and do keep abreast of the scholarship and culture of their day.

Modernism, however, has more consciously and profoundly pervaded and shaped Protestantism because its central principle is largely the same as that of this movement. This principle may be variously stated, but its deepest root is the right of private judgment or individual thinking or the rule of reason, as against the authority of church and traditional dogma. The Reformers claimed the right to study and interpret the Bible for themselves and to found their churches on its teachings and on Christ himself. They were scholars and thinkers, studying the New Testament in the original Greek and going back to the Church Fathers for their knowledge of the primitive church. They subjected everything to the light of reason and truth, including the Bible itself as is seen in Luther's very free handling of it. This principle was what wrought so much controversy and division among them. Authority can bind men into enforced unity, but reasoning leads them to different conclusions and divides them. This is the main reason why Protestantism separated into so many branches and is still dividing.

Each Protestant church followed its own sense of truth and stood up for it as on a rock from which it could not be moved. Its creed was its logical construction and demonstration of truth and its conscientious conviction, which was not to be abandoned or modified in the interest of unity or of anything else whatsoever. Such a

---

[11] *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, by Mathews and Smith, p. 116.

creed was a matter of religious life or death with the Reformers. This principle divided Luther and Calvin and in turn all their descendants so that to-day they form "a dust of systems and of creeds." Each Protestant denomination, whether Lutheran or Reformed, Episcopal or Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, or Methodist, was sure it had the truth and that its creed was the best unified statement of Christian faith and life.

The smaller the sect the more intense and sure this conviction was likely to be, as the narrower the channel the deeper and swifter the current. When the issue is "Athanasius against the world," then Athanasius will be unified and deepened in his convictions by the whole weight of the world's opposition. What can we make of a Protestant church whose official title is, "Old-Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit-Predestinarian Baptists," and which is credited with 387 members in this country?[12] However narrow and reactionary this creed may seem to us, to those that framed it it was the central vital truth of their Christian faith and the unified sum of all they knew. Even their scientific and literary knowledge and all their knowledge found systematic shelter under this roof and was harmonized with it.

Every Protestant church was and is moved by this principle and spirit. And so it is no fanciful or forced reading of all Christian churches, from the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic down to the latest and smallest and most fanatical Protestant sect, to see and say that they have all been moved and shaped by the principle of modernism.

8. Modern Councils and Creeds

Modern councils and creeds, like the ancient ones, have been the result of a strain in church polity or doctrine which accumulated to a point threatening revolt or rupture and called for adjustment that again unified the church. They grew out of the growth of new knowledge which modified the old faith and demanded a new credal expression.

The Roman Catholic Church lists twenty ecumenical councils.

---

[12] *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, by Mathews and Smith, p. 43.

We have noted some of the early ones, and in modern times the Council of Trent, already referred to, was called to reform the abuses that called forth the Reformation, and the Vatican Council (1869-1870), the last ecumenical council it has held, defined the doctrine of papal infallibility.

The Protestant churches have held innumerable councils, conferences or assemblies where they have framed or revised their creeds. Some of the early and more important of these were: Lutheran, the Augsburg Confession (1530); Reformed, the First Helvetic Confession (1536); Anglican, the Thirty-nine Articles (1571); Presbyterian, the Westminster Confession (1646-47); Congregational, Browne's Statement of Congregational Principles (1582); Baptist, the Philadelphia Confession (1742); Methodist, the Twenty-five Articles (1784). All of these have been repeatedly revised or superseded with later confessions.

Each Protestant creed in its day was adopted as a synthetic statement of the faith of its adherents framed in terms to which they could all subscribe and which thus harmonized their differences. It was a piece of modernistic construction when it was produced.

But all creeds are crystallized into temporary fixity approaching finality and it is very difficult to revise or amend them without precipitating new divergences and antagonisms. At first the newly adopted creed is well abreast of existing knowledge and experience, but as knowledge keeps on advancing it begins to lag behind. This may cause little discomfort for a time and the creed may be interpreted in looser and more general terms that may conceal or include the widening disparity. But in time the gap between the old faith and the new knowledge becomes too wide and glaring to be glossed over, and then the matter is taken in hand and the old creed is revised in the light of broader knowledge and is again brought up to date. This process must from time to time be repeated, and thus modernism has its way.

In concluding this chapter we see that the process of bringing the old faith up to date in the light of new knowledge, which started in Babylon and Egypt and in Genesis and ran on through the Old and then the New Testament and out into the Apostolic church, has come down through the Christian centuries, everywhere quietly

working its will, breathing the balmy breath of spring upon the winter of Europe and breaking up its hard crust, creating the tremendous upheaval of the Reformation, writing and rewriting the church's creeds and always trying to keep the old faith up to date with the new knowledge—and this is modernism.

CHAPTER X

HISTORIC CONFLICTS BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE

Old faith and new knowledge have come most frequently and squarely into conflict along the border line between theology and science and we shall rapidly trace this line of conflict and adjustment at several typical points. The story is a long and large one involving practically the whole history of science in the Christian centuries and it has been written out in many volumes, some of which have been already referred to and are easily accessible.

These conflicts grew out of the theory that the Bible was equally authoritative in every field and at every point. This theory, as we have seen, has been generally abandoned and it is now seen that the Biblical writers were teaching religion and not science and that they necessarily expressed their religious teaching in the terms of the prevailing popular knowledge of history and science, just as they necessarily wrote in their own language. This principle, which now seems plain and necessary to us, was not observed by the early interpreters of Scripture and so they found new science in conflict with their old faith at many points and opposed the new with all the means and power they could command. This way of finding antagonism between science and theology has not yet wholly ceased and occasionally flares up in our day. Had the true principle of Biblical interpretation been observed earlier it would have saved theology and the church from much unhappy controversy and the same principle should settle some of the problems that are still troubling us.

Every great scientific discovery has at first been misunderstood and misrepresented and opposed by theology, and then in time theologians see its truth, generally after everybody else has seen it, and begin to grow friendly towards it and finally accept it and even build it as a new stone in their temple. Agassiz said that every

important scientific truth passes through three stages in the minds of theologians: first, they say it destroys the Bible; second, they say it can be reconciled with the Bible; third, they say, We always believed it. The author knew a college president who passed through these stages with reference to evolution. First, he opposed it, then he began to speak respectfully of it and, finally, he posed as a kind of authority on it. Theologians are notoriously slow in receiving progressive truth, and often with good reason as we have seen, and when God has a new truth to reveal to the world he generally tells it to somebody else first. Even the angels, when they came to announce the birth of Jesus, did not go up to Jerusalem and announce the good news to the priests and professors of theology in the Temple, but went to a sheep pasture and told it to shepherds. What a rebuke and warning is this to our ecclesiastical pretension and pride!

1. Some Historic Points of the Conflict

(1) *The Flat Earth.* First in this story came the flat earth. It was the universal view of the ancient world that the earth was flat with a vast tent or roof over it called the firmament or solid vault. The region above this firmament was an immense reservoir of water which poured down through "the windows of heaven" as rain when these were opened. This general view, which is not at first sight absurd, for it is just the way the world appears to us and even yet there are those who hold that it is flat,[1] was incorporated in all

[1] In his *Autobiography* Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace tells an amusing story of a Mr. John Hampden, a graduate of Oxford, who challenged scientific men to prove the rotundity of the earth, offering to stake five hundred pounds on the result. Mr. Wallace, after consulting with Sir Charles Lyell, thought it worth while to take him up and prove his error, as some people were being influenced by the challenge. An experiment was agreed upon, and at considerable expense Mr. Wallace carried it out. A telescope was set up in such a way as would prove the point, but Mr. Hampden refused to look through it and declared that he had won and would not pay the wager. Mr. Wallace brought suit for the money and was awarded it, but all this had no effect on the mind of Hampden, who doubtless died in his false faith. He was not the only opponent of established science who has "refused to look."

ancient literature, especially in the sacred books of all religions. The Bible is no exception to this rule and is everywhere pervaded with this view. It constantly speaks of the waters above and the waters under the firmament, of the heavens being stretched out as a curtain and of the four corners of the earth. The fact that the Bible writers all viewed the earth as flat cannot be reasonably questioned. However, they were not teaching this view but were only using it as a part of the language of their day in which they necessarily expressed their religious teaching.

When science began to doubt the flat earth and then to point out the indisputable evidence of its rotundity, Christian theologians fell upon these scientists as teaching heresy and destroying the Bible and condemned them to perdition. A single instance of this will be sufficient. An Egyptian monk of the sixth century of the name of Cosmas expounded the old view as being in conflict with the new science and proved his contention with numerous Scriptural quotations, all of which were germane and conclusive on his own premises as to the nature of Scripture. "Nothing can be more touching in its simplicity than Cosmas's summing up of his great argument. He declares, 'We say therefore with Isaiah that the heaven embracing the universe is a vault, with Job that it is joined to the earth, and with Moses that the length of the earth is greater than the breadth.' The treatise closes with rapturous assertions that not only Moses and the prophets, but also angels and apostles, agree to the truth of this doctrine, and that at the last day God will condemn all who do not accept it!"

And yet all our theologians and almost everybody now accepts this conclusion of science without a doubt or the slightest difficulty. The most extreme and fanatical fundamentalists do this very thing. How can they do this? Because this conflict was worked out and settled long ago so that now we have all become used to it and it fits us snugly like an old shoe or coat. Once it pinched terribly, but now everybody wears it with the most perfect comfort. And yet this first case of the conflict between theology and science is only a typical instance of the whole process and history of this principle and the principle is that of modernism. The old faith has been reinterpreted and brought up to date into harmony with

this piece of new science. Our fathers fought it, but now everybody says, We always believed it!

Here is a point where fundamentalists do not "play fair."[2] They accept the round earth and yet they rebel at evolution. But they have given their whole case away in accepting the round earth, for a flat earth is taught in the Bible in the same sense as and far more clearly than a fiat creation of man is, and they cannot accept the one and then logically reject the other. All fundamentalists who reject evolution as inconsistent with the Bible ought to go back and take their stand on the flat earth: that is where they logically belong. But some things become too ridiculous to be maintained, and so they must be adjusted in harmony with established science. Only in the case of some people this adjustment must have been made long ago when the pain of the process is all over before they can accept the result. They build the tombs of these prophets of science of earlier days while stoning the prophets of science in their own day; for "we do not like prophets until they are dead."[3]

(2) *The Moving Sun.* The next issue between theology and science was a more tremendous and revolutionary one than the discovery of the round earth. The whole ancient world believed that the earth was the stationary center of the whole universe around which all the heavenly bodies revolved. We need not be surprised at this view, for it is just what we seem to see with our eyes and was supported by the universal common sense of mankind.

Of course, the Bible in common with all ancient sacred books and literature of every kind held this view and always speaks in this language. The sun rises and sets and all such expressions were used by the Biblical writers, not in any figurative or phenomenal sense as we still and ever will use them, but as describing literal fact.

In time, however, men began to see facts that did not fit in with this theory, and the discrepancy was met by introducing a system of epicycles that brought the theory into harmony with the facts for a time. But the disorder continued to increase and additional

---

[2] See, *Do Fundamentalists Play Fair?* by Professor William M. Forrest, a brilliant bit of work that is a sharp thorn in the side of fundamentalists which they have not been able to extract.

[3] H. R. L. Sheppard, *The Impatience of a Parson*, p. 3.

epicycles were piled up into such a mass and weight of complexity that brought the whole system crashing down.

Glimpses of the truth had dawned on the Greek thinkers and from time to time others had caught fleeting visions of it, but Copernicus, a devout canon of the Roman Catholic Church, was the first to demonstrate the true theory in his *Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies,* a copy of which, damp from the press, was placed in his hands on May 24, 1543, just a few hours before his death.

Almost immediately suspicion fell upon the book and then grew into opposition and condemnation by the authorities of the church. However, the matter was held in abeyance for a time, partly by reason of a cringing, lying Preface prefixed to the book by Osiander, a friend of Copernicus to whom he had entrusted its publication. Osiander made it out that Copernicus in the book was only suggesting the theory as a piece of harmless imagination.

Early in the next century Galileo, armed with his newly-discovered telescope, came forward with further and indisputable proofs of the new theory, and then the storm broke upon him in untempered fury. It appears that some Roman Catholic authorities were willing to tolerate the view "as a theory" but not "as a fact," an untenable distinction and position that has been resorted to in our day by some opponents of evolution. Galileo was haled before the Inquisition and under threat of torture the old man on bended knee was forced to abjure the theory. Everybody now made bold to attack it. Books poured from the press marked by incredible vituperation. A papal bull was issued against it. "The Bishop of Fiesole screamed in rage against the Copernican system, publicly insulted Galileo, and denounced him to the Grand Duke." The eminent Cardinal Bellarmine and his followers declared that this "pretended discovery vitiates the whole Christian plan of salvation," "casts suspicion on the doctrine of the incarnation," and "upsets the whole basis of theology." All Europe became a kind of camp of howling dervishes. "There were intrigues and counter-intrigues, plots and counter-plots, lying and spying; and in the thickest of this seething, squabbling, screaming mass of priests, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals appear two popes, Paul V and Urban VIII."

The Protestants were not one whit behind the Roman Catholics

in this sorry business. Luther declared of Copernicus, "This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth." Calvin asked, "Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?" John Wesley declared the new ideas to "tend toward infidelity."

But the end could not be averted, though it was long delayed. The collapse came and left the theologians and the church in a pitiable plight. The Protestants escaped easily enough as they had spoken as individuals and not officially, but the Roman hierarchy and representatives were caught in their own official action and tried by every cunning and false device to find some loophole through which they could squeeze to save their doctrine of papal infallibility. But the truth, however crushed to earth, persisted in rising again and at last on September 11, 1822, the cardinals of the Holy Inquisition graciously agreed that "the printing and publication of works treating of the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun, in accordance with the general opinion of modern astronomers, is permitted at Rome." Mark that word "modern": Rome that has condemned "modernism" has set its seal to its root word and principle! However, some belated fundamentalists and obscurantists are still holding out, and as late as 1873 the president of a Lutheran Teachers' Seminary in St. Louis issued a book in which it is held that "The Entire Holy Scripture settles the question that the earth is the principal body of the universe, that it stands fixed, and that the sun and moon only serve to light it." There are still later survivals. Rev. Wilbur G. Voliva, of Zion City, Ill., proclaims this view, and it was maintained in an article in a January (1928) issue of *The Baptist Fundamentalist*, published at Fort Worth, Texas, the organ of Rev. Dr. J. Frank Norris.

Andrew D. White closed his long and illuminating account of this whole affair[4] with these just and wise words: "As to the older errors, the whole civilized world was at fault, Protestant as well as Catholic. It was not the fault of religion; it was the fault of that short-sighted linking of theological dogmas to scriptural texts which, in utter defiance of the words and works of the Blessed

[4] *Warfare of Science with Theology*, Vol. I, pp. 114-170.

Founder of Christianity, narrow-minded, loud-voiced men are ever prone to substitute for religion. Justly it is said by one of the most eminent among contemporary Anglican divines, that 'it is because they have mistaken the dawn for a conflagration that theologians have so often been foes of light.' "

Thus the greatest revolution that has ever taken place in the world of human thought was brought about and the old faith and the new knowledge were adjusted into harmony, although it took two hundred years to do it. This mighty storm stirred the whole sea of Western Europe to its deeps and raised billows that have scarcely yet subsided. But it was a storm that, while destructive of old error, was in a vastly greater degree constructive of new truth. It swept away the little box universe that was only the size of a toy in comparison with our modern view, contracting the horizon of the human scene to a pitifully narrow frame, and substituted for it our inconceivably vaster and grander universe that is still disclosing its unplumbed depths and far-off shores and is our constant astonishment. How much greater is our Bible and how much grander is our universe and our God because of this blazing outburst of new science.

And it was all a splendid piece of modernism, the most splendid the world has ever seen or possibly will see. And yet again all classes of scholars and theologians, including fundamentalists, accept it without a qualm or the blinking of an eye. Why? Because it was accomplished so long ago and we now have our Bible and our theology adjusted to it so that it fits us snugly and gives us not the least discomfort. And again the fundamentalists do not "play fair" by accepting this result and yet balking at and rejecting evolution. To accept the Copernican astronomy and yet reject evolution is like swallowing a camel and straining at a gnat. But the change which once made men's hearts quake and caused sore distress is now so thoroughly wrought into our creed that we are conscious of no difficulty whatever. It did contradict squarely the literal language and meaning of the Scriptural writers and seemed to tear the Bible to pieces from Genesis to Revelation, yet, now that our fathers have negotiated for us these rapids and rocks in our stream of thought, we find ourselves in a broad and smooth

sea and the ark of Scripture floats secure. Modernism did it and is doing it still.

(3) *The Six Days of Creation.* The controversy over the six days of creation in the first chapter of Genesis so closely parallels the course of discussion over the flat earth and moving sun that it may be treated more briefly. Again the issue was squarely between the old faith and new knowledge, and again modernism won.

The writer of the sublime first chapter of Genesis dramatized the story of creation in a masterpiece. It stands in wide contrast, as we have already seen, with earlier mythological accounts and challenges our admiration in the light of our modern science. But there can be no reasonable doubt that the writer of the chapter believed in six days of twenty-four hours each as the periods of the story. This is the natural meaning of the narrative ("And there was evening and there was morning, one day"), and it was held by the whole Hebrew and Christian world down to recent times.

But when geology began turning up the rocky leaves of the earth, a different story was revealed. Long ages stretching back through millions and billions of years were now seen to have inscribed their history on these imperishable pages. Again opposition set in from theological quarters and the old charges and arguments were repeated. "The favorite weapon of the orthodox party was the charge that the geologists were 'attacking the truth of God.' They declared geology 'not a subject of lawful inquiry,' denouncing it as 'a dark art,' as 'dangerous and disreputable,' as 'a forbidden province,' as 'infernal artillery,' and as 'an awful evasion of the testimony of revelation.'"[5]

Some eminent scientists, such as Buckland and Lyell, stood against the new views for a time, but they surrendered and changed sides. An eminent American Hebrew scholar, Moses Stuart, and notably Mr. Gladstone made a last stand against the new knowledge. A favorite breakwater against it and theory to account for fossils was the Noachian flood, but this barrier did not hold. Finally came the Babylonian tablets with their parallel stories of creation based on day periods, and the case against the six-day theory was complete.

---

[5] White, *Warfare of Science with Theology*, Vol. I, p. 223.

All this trouble disappears when we see that the Scriptural writer was telling the story of creation in accordance with the thought-terms or most advanced knowledge of his day. He had to write in the language of his time. No other way would have been understandable. We now read this chapter as a grand drama of creation teaching, not a scientific account of the origin of the world, but a religious view of it. Its great text is, "In the beginning God," and that fundamental note runs as a refrain through all its strains, as a theme through a symphony. Modernism saved the story of Genesis from the absurdity of mythology by rewriting it and bringing it up to date in accordance with its principle of harmonizing new knowledge with the old faith, and we by our interpretation are carrying the same process forward to-day.

(4) *Evolution.* Evolution is God's way of making things. If we put this fact first, midst and last in the discussion of this subject, it will keep us in the right road and save us much trouble.

Everything at this point depends upon a correct definition and delimitation of the field of evolution. Biological evolution, which is the only kind with which science is concerned except as the principle may be applied in the field of physics and astronomy, is the theory that each new species of plant or animal has been derived by a process of genetic descent or birth from a previous species, nothing being said or implied as to the underlying and ultimate cause of the process. Anything irreligious about this? We never could see that there is.

This evolution of new species from older ones is a fact that can be dealt with by scientific methods of observation and inference, and it should be kept clear from two confusing related matters. First, the fact of evolution should be kept apart from the proximate factors or causes of the process, for scientists are universally agreed, as we shall see, on the fact, but they differ on the proximate causes. They may be opposing one another on theories of these causes, when observers may think they are opposing evolution and this is not at all the case.

More important still it is that in this discussion the fact of phenomenal evolution should be kept wholly free from theories of the underlying and ultimate cause, or First Cause, of the process.

Here is where most of the trouble in this controversy arises. This deeper question belongs to the field of philosophy and theology and not at all to science, and scientists as such never discuss it. Many religious writers and opponents of evolution cannot discuss it without at once raising this deeper question and identifying evolution with some philosophic theory, such as materialism, which they see is destructive of their religion. But the two things are quite separate and should never be confused. A biological evolutionist may be an agnostic or a materialist or he may be a theist and a Christian. From the fact that he is an evolutionist there is no telling what his philosophic and religious views are, any more than when we know a man is a Democrat or a Republican in politics we can tell what his religious attitude and church relations are.

When the theory of evolution got into popular literature and current opinion following the publication of Darwin's epochal book on the *Origin of Species* in 1859, it soon created widespread alarm in the religious world, just as had the Copernican astronomy and other scientific discoveries. Especially as applied to man, evolution became overloaded with emotion, and uncontrolled emotion is one of the greatest enemies of truth. The emotion that became associated with evolution was that it is destructive of religion. It was at once attacked as atheistic and ridiculed and vituperated with all the old weapons and spirit and many a book was launched against it that is now a theological curioisty.[6] One clerical opponent of the theory was credited in 1873, by the *Boston Monthly Religious Magazine,* with having "demolished the evolution theory, knocking the breath out of it and throwing it to the dogs," and a Methodist Bishop displayed equal temerity and ignorance.[7]

One of the first men in the religious field to take a bold stand in favor of the theory was James McCosh, the president of Princeton College, who was an eminent author and authority in both science and theology. He maintained the following position: "It is now admitted that Christians may hold, in perfect consistency with

---

[6] One of these was by the eminent Charles Hodge of Princeton and was entitled, *What Is Darwinism?* His answer was that it is atheism and the little book showed a singular misunderstanding of the subject.

[7] For these and other instances see White, *Warfare of Science with Theology,* Vol. I, pp. 80-81.

religion and Genesis, that certain layers of rock were formed, not at once by a fiat of God, but mediately by water and fire as the agents of God. And are they not at liberty to hold, always if evidence be produced, that higher plants have been developed from lower, and higher brutes from lower, according to certain laws of descent, known or unknown, working in favorable circumstances? There is nothing irreligious in the idea of development, properly understood. We have constant experience of development,—of the development of individual plants and animals from parent plants and animals. And why, if proof be produced, should we not be allowed to believe in the development of a new species from the crossing of two species in favorable circumstances?'' [8]

Dr. McCosh's outspoken position did much to allay alarm on the subject of evolution in the Protestant churches and religious circles of America half a century ago. He stood so tall and strong that smaller men were afraid to attack him, and those who accepted or leaned towards the theory found ample shelter under his protecting shadow. And so it came about that no minister or theological professor was disturbed on account of his views on this subject, with the exception of a single theological professor in the South who was deprived of his chair, and in time the subject quieted down and became generally viewed in all quarters as a theory that was open to Christian interpretation and acceptance.

In recent years, however, following in the wake of the Great War, which, like an abysmal submarine upheaval, stirred up so many deeps and brought various strange creatures to the surface, especially in premillennial and fundamentalist waters, there has been an unexpected and violent recrudescence of attack on evolution as

---

[8] *Christianity and Positivism*, 1871, p. 37. A later distinguished successor of Dr. McCosh in the presidency of Princeton, Dr. Francis L. Patton, expresses the same view in his recent work, *Fundamental Christianity*, in which he says, ''The doctrine of evolution is not necessarily materialistic. It is quite compatible with theism.'' And a still later and still more distinguished successor in the presidency of Princeton, Woodrow Wilson, when asked, ''Do you believe in evolution?'' answered, ''Of course like every other man of intelligence and education I do believe in Organic Evolution. It surprises me that at this late date such questions should be raised.'' See a pamphlet by Rev. Hay Watson Smith containing answers from many eminent men to this question.

anti-Christian and atheistic. The fundamentalists almost unanimously have made war on it and published much against it and agitated opposition to it in our churches and schools and colleges. In the South they have organized a movement to influence or force state legislatures to pass laws prohibiting the teaching of the theory in all tax-supported schools. The movement succeeded in Tennessee, putting Dayton on the map and making the state an object of ridicule the world around. The movement has apparently been effectually stopped in the South and, of course, there was no slightest chance of its gaining any success in the North.

This movement, however, throws a searchlight into the reactionary mind, suddenly and sharply revealing its notion of and attitude towards truth, as though it could be determined and controlled, not by evidence and logic, but by state legislation. This is a medieval notion, and as well might it be attempted by legislation to annul and prohibit the daily rising of the sun or the nightly march of the constellations. Some excellent men think that such things can be controlled by votes and that if they could only get all church assemblies and state legislatures to vote evolution down, it would trouble us and we would hear of it no more. It is not on record, however, that Mrs. Partington succeeded in sweeping back the Atlantic with her broom. And so we are faced with a new outbreak against evolution on religious grounds, which Dr. McCosh so effectually undermined and quieted down in the last generation, and this battle of old faith and new knowledge is being fought over again. Of course, the scientific men have no part or interest in it, but are only amused or amazed at it.

One of the commonest assertions of the opponents of evolution is that "it is a mere theory or guess," and that "not a single fact has been adduced in support of it." A more baseless assertion could hardly be made. Evolution rests on a broad basis of facts which are no secret of scientific men but are written out in libraries of books and, deeper still, are written in the rocks and on the whole world of living things. Biologists do not ask or want us to believe in evolution simply because they do, unanimous though they be, but they show us the facts and reasons for this doctrine and ask us to see and examine and judge these evidences for ourselves.

This is no place and the writer is no expert to present the facts and arguments for evolution, but it may be helpful to some readers to give the briefest outline of these evidences that convince the whole scientific world of the truth of this theory.

I. Development of all living things from single cells. Every plant and animal from microbe to man starts with a single cell and proceeds through stages of growth or evolution to maturity. When God now makes an oak or a man, He does not start with dust but with a living cell and gradually develops or creates it. Does not this involve the whole principle of evolution as Dr. McCosh pointed out? The development of a new species by the same process involves no new principle or difficulty, as compared with the development of an individual, for either science or religion. Does such development shut God out of the cornfield or the nursery? We never could see any radical difference between the process of creating a new individual and that of creating a new species by evolution. Why grant the one as altogether in accordance with religion and then balk at the other as irreligious and atheistic?

II. The modifiability of living organisms. All living things are plastic and subject to modification, as we see in our domestic plants and animals. If each species were fixed in form, this would shut out evolution, but this plasticity opens the door to variations that may accumulate into or cause a new species. Our domestic animals and plants and the various human races are notable instances of this plasticity which lies at the root of evolution.

III. The principle of classification. All plants and animals are related, and the closer the species the closer is this relation so that two animals of allied species may correspond bone for bone and muscle for muscle. As a result of this, all plants and animals may be arranged in a genealogical system, starting at the bottom with single cells and mounting upward and branching outward so as to embrace the whole kingdom of life, after the manner of a family genealogy. The mere sight of this system of classification and relationship produces on the mind a powerful impression that it was along these lines that life grew or was created, as in the case of the family genealogy.

IV. Geographical distribution. The plant and animal life in any large region, as a continent or a large island, has affinities constituting it a system with distinctive features of its own. North America has one system of life and South America another. Madagascar has a fauna and flora related to and yet different from the continent with which it was once connected. The island of St. Helena has about twenty-eight species of butterflies only one of which is found anywhere else in the world: How did these twenty-seven indigenous species originate there and nowhere else? Did they not all spring from a common species through long ages of isolation from the rest of the world? Just as the people of countries, such as France and Germany, have sprung from a common stock and grown apart by separation, so the plant and animal life of each general region has developed its own type in this way.

V. Geological succession. This fact shows that the genealogical tree of living forms runs its rocky roots down through all the strata of the earth. At the bottom are found traces of the simplest forms of life and these grow into or are succeeded by higher types up through the whole sixty miles of stratified rock, culminating in vertebrates and man at the top. What is the meaning of this succession of fossil forms but that this was the order of their development?

VI. Embryological recapitulation. The embryos of all animals start from single cells and pass through similar stages of development, each one stopping at the point where it reaches maturity while the others go on. It is as though they all started in a railway train with tickets to different stations along the line; each one gets off at its own station, but man only has a through ticket and goes to the end of the road. Each higher animal thus passes through and recapitulates the stages of lower ones. This is a very general statement of this fact which is subject to various modifications. This fact is open to our observation in text-books where illustrations of it are given,[9] or, far better still, such embryos arranged in their order may be seen in a medical or biological laboratory or museum. What is the meaning of this remarkable fact but that it is a survival of the way these animals evolved in their early history?

VII. Vestigial organs. Every animal has remnants of organs that were once in use and then through disuse atrophied into mere vestiges of their former selves. The human vermiform appendix, that has now become so unfashionable, is an illustration, but the human body has more than a hundred such vestigial organs and is a veritable museum of ancient relics. What is the explanation of this fact? As organs develop through evolution, so may they degenerate through devolution, and this is an illustration of the general law.

VIII. Blood tests. A recent fact bearing on the theory of evolution is that a certain blood test by means of an injected serum gives the same reaction for animals of the same species. All human beings give the same reaction, and this is another proof of the unity of the race. But the test, when applied to an allied species, gives a slightly different reaction, and the more distant the related species the greater is the difference in the reaction. The blood of man and that of the highest anthropoids give different but closely allied reactions, thus indicating close relationship in biological nature and origin.

These are eight "facts," or "things done," in the most literal sense of the word, and they are open to everyone's observation. They are stamped upon the rocky framework of the globe and interwoven into the whole texture and web of the life of the earth. No

[9] See Lull's *Principles of Organic Evolution* in which is given a series of embryos of twelve animals strikingly illustrating the fact.

one can miss seeing these facts unless he looks at them with blind eyes or with a mind closed to truth. Taken together they are a logical chain closely linked that leads to but one conclusion, the biological evolution of life from simple beginnings. This conclusion, of course—and this is a point that must always be kept in view—is not saying or implying a word about the ultimate cause of this process of evolution, which, as we have seen, is an independent question falling to philosophy and religion.

What explanation do the opponents of evolution give to these facts? Do they say that God created each and all of these species of life independently of one another and that, in particular, He created man by fiat out of the dust of the earth? Put this question to a fundamentalist and it invariably gives him a pause. The author has asked this question of fundamentalists of education and eminence and they have repudiated an affirmative answer and even resented having such a view imputed to them. Yet what is their view? They seem to us to refuse to face this question fairly and frankly. If they say that God created all these forms of life, this is a philosophical answer that does not meet the scientific question, and as to this answer it is the one given by all theists and Christian believers.

A paragraph may be added as to the various theories relating to the immediate factors or causes of evolution about which evolutionists still differ.

I. The theory of Lamarck that animals develop organs by use and adaptations to their environment and thus in time evolve new species. It is admitted that there is a degree of truth in this theory, but it is not the chief cause of the process.

II. Darwin's theory of natural selection holds that nature acts as a sieve to sift out animals and plants having variations advantageous in the struggle of life, resulting in the survival of the fittest and in time in the accumulation of these variations into new species. Natural selection is a fact in operation before our eyes and it plays a part in the selection and preservation of nascent new species. Some biologists still hold to it as the chief cause in the process, but others and perhaps most have retired it to a subordinate place.

III. De Vries' theory of mutations. This eminent Dutch botanist discovered, as he claimed, new species of primroses growing wild near Amsterdam which he regarded as new species and which had originated all at once by a leap or mutation. "Sports" are familiar facts in nature; Darwin allowed for such leaps, but De Vries' theory has not gained general acceptance, though mutations are admitted to be one cause at work.

IV. The biologists are now searching for the secret of new species in modifications in the embryos. William Bateson, the eminent English geneticist, in a notable address delivered on December 21, 1921, before the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Toronto, Canada, held that when a new species originates "a new ingredient" has been added to the old stock. This theory is still under investigation, as is the whole process of evolution. "A new ingredient"? What is this but that which was written by them of old time? "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here is a process asserting the fact of the divine creation, but leaving wide room and any length of time for the process. "Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground": here is a part and element in the process that came up from below; "and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul": here is a part and element that came down from above; here is the "new ingredient," the breath of life and living soul added to the dust of the ground, the old stock. We must thank this eminent biologist and evolutionist for this word. It would appear that biology is now approaching theology and that science and religion, genetics and Genesis, may here be wedded into harmonious and indissoluble union. However, we must leave this solution of the problem to the experts.

Now, while scientific men agree as to the fact of evolution, they differ as to these causes, and the opponents of evolution are continually confusing these two things and when they find evolutionists differing as to the factors they assume and assert that they are denying evolution itself.

Scientific men are practically unanimous in their adherence to this theory. Here is evidence and proof of this point, which fundamentalists generally dispute. The American Association for the Advancement of Science has about 12,000 members. At its Boston meeting in 1922 the Council of the Association issued the following statement:

The Council of the Association affirms that, so far as the scientific evidences of the evolution of plants and animals and man are concerned there is no ground whatever for the assertion that these evidences constitute a "mere guess." No scientific generalization is more strongly supported by thoroughly tested evidences than is that of organic evolution.

The Council affirms that the evidences in favor of the evolution of man are sufficient to convince every scientist of note in the world, and that these evidences are increasing in number and importance every year.

The Council of the Association also affirms that the theory of evolution is one of the most potent of the great influences for good that have thus far entered into human experience; it has promoted the progress of knowledge, it has fostered unprejudiced inquiry, and it has served as an invaluable aid in humanity's search for truth in many fields.

"Every scientist of note in the world" now supports this theory and not one can be quoted against it. It is now taught in every standard college and university in the world, including the Catholic University at Washington. Even the theological seminaries have opened their doors to it, and it is accepted and wrought into the structure of systematic theology in practically all our standard theological institutions. Even Princeton Seminary is no exception to this rule. When William Brenton Greene, Professor of Apologetics in that institution, was asked, in a symposium on the subject, whether evolution was taught in his institution, his published answer was, "Evolution is taught in this institution as one of the ways of God's working."[10] Princeton comes near making it unanimous.

If it be said, however, that all the "facts" that have been piled up in favor of evolution do not reach demonstration but only probability, it may be frankly admitted that no conclusion in science, outside or even inside mathematics, reaches absolute certainty, especially since Einstein has apparently upset the universe, however slightly he may have tipped it over. Nevertheless, these evidences are such as to convince "every scientist of note in the world."

Now what can fundamentalists and opponents of evolution put up against this mass of evidence and weight of expert authority? Nothing of any worth that commands respect in college and university circles. The articles and books they publish against it are mostly written by ministers and non-scientific men who are out of their field and use outworn dogmatic methods and show their inacquaintance with or their misunderstanding, not to say their misrepresentation, of the subject. As Dr. Francis L. Patton has said: "The anti-evolutionists have been fighting blindly because they have not themselves the scholarship to know just what they are attacking." Almost without exception they confuse biological evolution with some materialistic philosophy of it; they constantly shift from the scientific facts and evidences to their religious objections to what they conceive to be the consequences of the theory to their faith; and some of them exhibit in their worst form the

[10] Published in *The Christian Standard* of Cincinnati, Ohio.

old theological methods and spirit of discussion that are no longer good form in circles where the scientific spirit of simple truth-seeking prevails. Some of them select and color up and twist facts to suit their theory, and they are expert at imputing to the supporters of evolution inferences and opinions and sinister motives which are utterly foreign to these men.

They also have their "list of authorities" against evolution, but these are usually worthless. When they do quote a scientific man, it generally turns out either that he belongs to a former generation or else that he is opposing some view as to the cause of evolution but not evolution itself. Some of these are stock quotations that are repeated by writers who have never seen the books from which they are alleged to have been taken, but simply pass them on from other such books and when some of these quotations are run down, as the author has done with several of them, they are either not genuine or are garbled. Not one of these authorities is a professor of science in a standard college or university, unless they misunderstand one of their own authorities as in the case of Professor L. T. More's book on *The Dogma of Evolution.* Possibly misled by its title they actually list this work among their "authorities," supposing that it is with them and apparently not having the wit to see that it is against them, telling these very men that "the clergy are making a mistake in opposing biological evolution." But their most eminent "authority" is George McCready Price who is exploited in most of their articles and books as a great geologist and authority against evolution. No doubt he is an excellent gentleman and sincere Christian, but he with his *New Geology* is simply a laughingstock among geologists. He has a wild system of his own in which he tears up the whole foundation and superstructure of modern geology, denying anybody can know the ages and order of the rocks, going back to a general deluge to account for fossils, and declaring in italics that "there are no fossils older than man on the planet." He cannot get any recognition from geologists or get an article of his in any scientific journal, according to his own complaint. This honor, however, was reserved for and given to him by *The Princeton Theological Review,* the organ of Princeton Theological Seminary. Probably the editor did not know what he was doing in admitting it. What a burst of laughter

must have greeted its appearance across the campus in Princeton University where eminent authorities in science unanimously teach evolution and where President Woodrow Wilson had presided, who was saying, or had said, "Like every other man of intelligence and education I do believe in organic evolution."

How long will our well-meaning but ill-informed opponents of evolution carry on their war on this theory, a war on the scientific knowledge and higher culture of the world, a war that is perfectly futile and was long since hopelessly lost? Do they ever suspect what damage they may be doing to the church and Christianity and especially our Christian young people? Dr. James McCosh declared that "the most dangerous thing which could be done to Christianity at Princeton was to reiterate in the University pulpit, week after week, solemn declarations that if evolution by natural selection, or indeed evolution at all, be true, the Scriptures are false."[11] We dig a chasm of separation and hostility between our religion and our scientific knowledge at our peril. This knowledge will grow from more to more as the thoughts of men widen with the process of the suns, and then such churches and ministers as oppose it will be left stranded in their obscurantism. We believe the time has come when our educated ministers should speak out on the subject from their pulpits. They should set it in such light that their people will see that evolution, properly conceived and stated, is consistent with the Bible and the most loyal adherence to Christian faith.

And the time has come when we should give to this view of the process of divine creation, not simply meager room and a grudging reception, but abundant room and a warm welcome. Of course, we are speaking now, and all the way through this discussion, of evolution as a method of God's working that is to be interpreted in the fullest harmony with our Christian faith and are excluding all philosophical interpretations of it that are hostile to such faith. It admits of such Christian interpretation, as Dr. McCosh long ago assured us and as Dr. Patton now assures us, just as clearly and certainly as the Copernican astronomy and modern geology; in

---

[11] The *Church and Science,* by Hector Macpherson, p. 186.

fact, it is more easily adjusted to our Christian faith, for while the Scripture writers did believe and necessarily wrote in the scientific concepts of their day, evolution was not one of these, for it had not yet risen above the horizon of human thought. However, they did unconsciously write in terms that really include the principle of evolution, for they describe creation as a gradual progressive process. In fact, evolution is written broadly across and woven into the first chapters of Genesis and is the divine program of creation. Especially does the account of the creation of man, as we have seen, leave room for this process, beginning with dust and ending with spirit. The assertion so generally and constantly made by fundamentalists that evolution is necessarily materialistic and atheistic is contrary to the plain facts. It is not a whit more so than modern astronomy and geology, which our fundamentalists all swallow without blinking an eye.[12] Evolutionists may be materialists and some of them are, but this is due to their philosophy and not to their science.

As a matter of fact, many and possibly most scientific evolutionists are men of theistic or Christian faith. Such eminent scientists and evolutionists as Sir Oliver Lodge, J. Arthur Thomson and J. S. Y. Simpson in England and Scotland, and John M. Coulter, Henry F. Osborn and Robert A. Millikan in this country, are active communicants and some of them are elders or officers in our churches—a list that could be indefinitely extended, and it is time that fundamentalists should cease from libeling evolutionists as materialists and infidels.

In May, 1923, ten distinguished theologians and churchmen, fifteen scientists of the highest authority in their respective departments and ten well-known men of affairs issued "A Joint Statement upon the Relations of Science and Religion," in which they "deeply regret that in recent controversies there has been a tendency to present science and religion as irreconcilable and antagonistic

[12] From an eminent American Roman Catholic authority came "a declaration which has a very curious sound, but which it would be ungracious to find fault with—that the doctrine of evolution is no more in opposition to the doctrine of the Catholic Church than is the Copernican theory or that of Galileo." White, *Warfare of Science with Theology*, Vol. I, p. 156.

domains of thought, for in fact they meet distinct human needs, and in the rounding out of human life they supplement rather than displace or oppose each other." They furthermore declare that "it is a sublime conception of God which is furnished by science, and one wholly consonant with the highest ideals of religion."

Evolution is to be seen and welcomed as a grand unfolding of the ways of God in creation. It is simply a sublime exposition of the text, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Instead of denying or circumscribing God, it allows Him to use His own wisdom and way in creation and gives Him all the room he wants. It traces His stately steppings through the rocks, leaving His footprints in the imprints of fossil remains. It turns the whole earth and the heavens into an older and grander Bible that rolled from the hands of God before Moses wrote and Paul spoke. It is a kind of infidelity to deny or not to see this Scripture and not to read it and rejoice in it. To deny any truth is disloyalty to the God of all truth.

Not only does evolution throw its broad light into the processes of creation, but it also illuminates all other fields of human knowledge. All sciences and departments of knowledge are now studied and unfolded in its light and are fertilized by it. It is one of the greatest discoveries and most powerful instruments of investigation and progress in knowledge and civilization of our day. This is now generally seen and it is used in all our standard institutions of learning. If fundamentalists cannot see this, their children will, as we all now see things to which our forefathers were blind. There is no stopping the rising of the sun.

Our conclusion on the subject of evolution is the same as in the case of the flat earth and the moving sun. The old view has passed away and the new view has been established and has come to stay. It is folly to resist it and in so doing we are only isolating our religious faith from the knowledge and culture of our time and dooming it to wither into an outworn husk. The old faith and new knowledge are already wedded into indissoluble union to the immense enlargement and enrichment of both, and we should have the intelligence and wisdom to see and welcome this tremendous instance and triumph of modernism.

2. The Conflict Reviewed

This long battle may now be briefly reviewed from several points of observation and comment.

(1) This conflict between old faith and new knowledge is not peculiar to the relations of science and religion, but is universal in the fields of thought. History and sociology, literature and art have been and are just as much divided and disturbed by it. Government is notoriously torn into warring theories and parties by it. There are also just such internal disturbances within both science and religion themselves. Old and new scientific theories are constantly under debate, and just now the scientific world is divided in a tremendous controversy over Einstein's theory of relativity which an eminent authority has declared will take two hundred years for its final settlement. That religion also has its own internal difficulties and strifes is written across all its history. Neither science nor religion is disputatious and pugnacious above other branches of knowledge, and they have only such differences as are common to all the fields of truth.

(2) The conflict between science and religion has never been a sharp division between scientists on one hand and theologians on the other, but has cut across these fields with some scientific and some religious men on both sides. In the case of the greatest division and controversy, the heliocentric astronomy, Copernicus, who wrote the epochal book demonstrating this theory, was a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, and the eminent Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe, who belonged to the next generation, opposed the theory to the end of his days. The same fact has been true in all these intellectual battles. It never has been the case that all the scientists were arrayed against all the theologians, but the issue has divided both of these classes. This shows that in these conflicts it was not altogether a matter of progressive intelligence on one side against obscurantism on the other, but, at first at least, a case of divided evidence and an honest difference of opinion on both sides.[13] It must be admitted, however, that theologians have been

[13] This is a point that is not fully and fairly brought out in White's *Warfare of Science with Theology* and it is corrected with broader knowledge

slower in recognizing new scientific truth and have often resisted it long after it had come into general acceptance. Yet there is a reason, as we have seen, why religion is rightly more conservative and slower in accepting new theories than is science.

(3) And therefore the infirmities and faults connected with these conflicts have not been all on one side. Human nature is universal and manages to show itself in all fields. The theologian, jealous of his interests and zealous for his rights, is apt to think that he is fitted and authorized to step over into the field of science and pass judgment on its processes and results, and sometimes he appears to think that he speaks with divine authority and that to doubt him is to be an enemy of religion. The partisanship and dogmatism, not to speak of unfairness and misrepresentations, of many a theologian have been a painful and pitiful spectacle in the history of theology. On the other hand, the scientist may think that his special authority and prestige in his own field give him an equal right to speak in the field of religion, and he may assume and presume to pronounce judgments on the highest and holiest interests of humanity and brand them as outworn superstition and bigotry. These dogmatists bring both religion and science into disrepute and in no small degree they have been the cause of the long unhappy conflict between these two fundamental fields of thought and interests of life. Both classes of partisans are now happily passing and are no longer respectable; they are becoming obsolete in the scholarly world.

(4) As a matter of fact, all these controversies between old faith and new science are in time adjusted into deeper truth and wider harmony, and then religion and science dwell together in peace until some other revolutionary scientific truth appears. It is usually found that there are truth and error on both sides and both have something to give up or modify and something to receive. It has turned out in the various controversies of the past which we have referred to that theology was contending for some form of knowledge that was unessential to its faith and the new knowledge gave to it a broader vision and a grander expression.

---

and fairer interpretation in Murray's *Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century.*

Have not our modern geology and astronomy given us a greater Genesis and a vastly more majestic heavens than the old views for which theologians contended so earnestly but mistakenly? The conflict between science and religion, then, is a necessary recurrent stage and experience in the development of both science and religion and the outcome is good. While at first such conflict is not joyous but grievous, nevertheless afterward it yields the peaceable fruit of larger truth and better life.

CHAPTER XI

MODERNISM TODAY

Modernism, being a principle and a process, runs through all fields and all ages and is, therefore, to be seen in operation to-day; in fact, it is more active to-day than ever before because we have developed a more acute and imperative sense of the unity of all truth and of the need of harmonizing all our views of reality into coherence. In former times men were not so conscious of this need, but even then they unconsciously endeavored to bring their beliefs into mutual harmony. It is true that the human mind could never endure a conscious contradiction, but at times it has had a large capacity for inconsistency. We now search for contradictions and inconsistencies and drag all our beliefs into the open and test them to see that they fit together without break or wrinkle. We have a passion for unity and in all fields we are striving to adjust our knowledge into a coherent system, and this is the principle of modernism. We shall note its operation as it is now going on in several fields of thought.

1. In the Field of Science

This is the field in which we can see modernism most actively at work, for every scientific theory is at once brought to the test of consistency with every other truth, not only in science but in religion and all other fields.

(1) *The Vastness of the Universe.* No other science has gone forward with such strides and leaps in our day as astronomy. Within the last few years it has made astounding discoveries and expanded the universe into spaces, magnitudes and speeds beyond any former dreams. Once the astronomers saw things which frightened us: now they see things which frighten them. They

turn from their telescopes and spectroscopes with blanched faces to tell us of what they have witnessed.

A hundred years ago Herschel said that we could never know the diameters of the stars; for no instrument then known could disclose a disk and the most powerful telescope only makes a star shoot more vivid flashes of light. In recent years, however, there has been invented the interferometer which measures these diameters with approximate accuracy. One of the first stars thus measured was Antares and its diameter turned out to be four hundred million miles. It was known to be a big star, but no astronomer dreamed of any such solar monster as that. Our earth is about one hundred million miles distant from the sun, so that if our sun were placed in the center of Antares our earth would be one hundred million miles within the star, or halfway between its circumference and its center. And so our sun is a very small star and there are others that in size and mass and brightness dwarf it into relative insignificance.

It has long been known that the nearest star to our solar system that has yet been discovered is about four light-years distant, a light-year, which is the yardstick or mile which astronomers use in measuring celestial spaces, being the distance that a ray of light, moving at the rate of 186,300 miles a second, travels in a year. An enormous chasm thus separates our earth and solar system from the nearest star. But stars have now been discovered that are a million and even hundreds of millions of light-years distant. And still the frontiers of the universe have not been reached and the question whether it has any bounds hangs in doubt.

A new order of speed has also been discovered. Our sun, attended with its family of planets, is moving through space at something like twenty miles a second, but this is a moderate rate of celestial traveling and is as the speed of an ox-cart compared with a locomotive or even with a rifle ball. Stars have now been discovered that are moving at the rate of twelve hundred miles a second: every tick of a watch they are twelve hundred miles farther away and they would flash from New York to San Francisco in less than three seconds. Imagination is crushed and has ceased to form any conception of such magnitudes and distances and speeds and we use these bewildering figures without any corresponding ideas.

Greater wonders yet are being disclosed. There are scattered all over the heavens faint patches of light that are either vast tracts of luminous gas or star-dust, or are huge clusters and masses of stars. The gaseous nebulæ appear to be remnants left over from the making of solar systems or else are material out of which such systems are being made. Most of the gaseous nebulæ belong to our own galaxy, or stellar system, but the nebulæ which are spiral in shape are at enormous distances compared with the stars of our galaxy and are viewed as separate galaxies like our own, or "island universes." Our Milky Way, which is composed of billions of stars and runs around our sky as a faint band of light, is our galaxy to which our sun belongs, and as it goes around our heavens our sun is somewhere near the center of it. This galaxy is variously estimated as to its size, one estimate being that it is three hundred thousand light-years in diameter and about ten thousand light-years thick, it being disk-shaped like a watch. These spiral nebulæ are galaxies similar to our own and, therefore, composed of millions and billions of stars. The vast arms that wind out from their centers show that they are unitary systems with some common origin and development, and the huge stars in these arms indicate that they are galaxies in the making and passing through different stages of development, some of them, like the Magellanic Clouds, appearing to have shrunk into scattered remnants. It is these giant spirals, the most mysterious and terrifying objects in the heavens, that are moving relatively to us at twelve hundred miles a second and are a million light-years distant from us. There are millions if not billions of them and they are discovered at successive distances up to a hundred million light-years and indefinitely beyond.

We are thus ushered into a universe of a new order of magnitudes outrunning all our powers of conception, consisting of countless star-clusters and vast constellations and nebulæ, a boundless snow-storm of suns and systems, huge solar monsters moving at frightful speeds, an infinite complexity of fiery wheels within wheels and blazing galaxies beyond galaxies, leaving us doubting our own senses and wondering if things are as we see them to be.

Where are we in this stupendous scheme of things? Does not

this universe reduce us to atoms of insignificance, infinitesimal insects of an hour? Is not our tiny earth only a minute ant-hill troubled in the gleam of a million million suns? What becomes of all our beliefs and hopes about the greatness and worth of man? What place can he hold in such a picture? Undoubtedly the first effect of such overwhelming views tends to smother our faith into the darkness of despair. A prominent New York minister has said that, while listening recently to an astronomer presenting such views, he felt his faith in God being undermined and destroyed. The astronomer himself may have a similar experience. "Man's station in this scheme," says Harold Shapley, Director of the Harvard Observatory, "is not too flattering—an animal among many, precariously situated on the crust of a planetary fragment that obeys the gravitational impulses of one of the millions of the dwarf stars that wander in remote parts of a galactic system."[1] The astronomer, however, in making this observation has stepped outside of his field of science into the region of philosophical speculation.

But the first effect of new truth is not necessarily the last effect, and often our difficulties and doubts lead to larger faith. The cure for troubled thought is always more thought. We are to think forward into clearer light and truer views and not slip backward into deeper doubt and despair. The ultimate effect of these enormously enlarged views of the universe is to give us a correspondingly enlarged view of man. For how comes it that we know this universe and explore all these infinite spaces and speeds? Is it not the human mind that does this, and does it not thus subordinate to itself the very universe that threatened to crush it? It is the mind of man that traces the order of these worlds, swinging every star into its orbit and appointing the bounds of these spirals, imposing its own laws of thought upon every sun and system and seeing that no star slips from its track or shoots a forbidden ray. The human mind thus virtually sets up its own throne amidst this star-spangled expanse and mounts into mastery over it. All these stars and solar monsters come creeping to his feet and bow before him and accept the laws of his mind.

---

[1] *Starlight*, p. 143.

And so the big star is at the little end of the telescope, the star of the human brain that is looking and not the star that is being looked at. Which would tip the scales, Shakespeare's sonnets or Sirius, Plato or the Pleiades? Idealistic philosophy dissolves the whole material universe into a manifestation of mind or a spiritual system which is the content of an Infinite Mind and in which our minds share.

This reaction to the greatness of the universe was the Psalmist's experience. At first he was staggered by the blazing expanse of the heavens. "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained, what is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" His faith is now wavering and he feels his feet slipping. But instantly he recovers himself with the thought: "For thou hast made him but little lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honour." Now he has recovered his faith in the worth of man, and the greatness of the heavens has only enhanced the greatness of man. The greater the universe, the greater is man that thinks it. And so the first effect of astronomical discoveries may cast a cloud upon our faith, but the final and proper effect is to clear away the doubt and give us a new and profoundly greater sense of the infinite worth of man.

And by the same measure, also, is the greatness of God magnified. It is His hand that has woven all this infinite fabric of suns and systems and whirling spirals, and the hand is always greater than its own product, as the architect is greater than his building, and the painter than his picture. The expanse of the heavens, however far it may stretch beyond our ken, is only the mighty workshop of God in which suns and systems are flying from His giant forge as sparks of fire. "Our God is a great God!" So exclaimed the Hebrew poet and night-watcher of the skies, and with how much greater knowledge and appreciation, wonder and worship, can we utter the same exclamation! We can now join with deeper knowledge another exclamation of a Hebrew poet, "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways, and how small a whisper do we hear of him!" Let us not fear that God's work can ever drive Him from His world or destroy our faith, but amidst these splendor-sprinkled star-fields let us bow before Him all the more rever-

ently and trust Him all the more confidently. So have we built this immensely enlarged modern knowledge into the temple of our religion and thereby correspondingly enlarged and enriched it. And this is modernism.

(2) *The Universality of Law.* Another modern scientific doctrine impinging upon the field of faith is the universality of law. Science is the search for order and harmony and final unity, and it finds these in the reign of law. Nature at first sight presents the appearance of confusion and chaos, and men have slowly threaded their way through its jungle and cleared it up into law and system. The physical world has been widely brought under this principle, and now it is believed, though this belief can never be proved and is an immense exercise of faith, in accordance with Huxley's profession of profound faith in the rationality of "the cosmic order" that law reigns down to the last atom and electron of the universe.

The same general principle has been extended to the mental and moral and spiritual world, though there is some distinction between physical and ethical laws, the latter involving a voluntary and purposive element. Human souls, however, are not capricious beings forming a chaotic social order, but are law-saturated organisms in an orderly system.

This extension of the reign of law, until it has become coterminous with the whole field of being, at first seems to reduce personality to mechanism and thereby imprison and destroy its essential nature of moral freedom and responsibility. As law was extended over each additional area it seemed that both man and God, considered as free beings, were driven out of that field and shut up in a narrower sphere in which to act and exist, and that finally they were crowded out of the law-ruled universe altogether. God, according to this view, has thus become imprisoned in His own world, and His personality has been rendered impotent and has been destroyed, and much more has man lost his personality in the same irresistible process. Undoubtedly this universal reign of law has made it seem more difficult for the modern mind to believe in either the personality of God or the freedom of man.

But again the difficulty is greatest at first view, and abates and disappears under reflection. In the case of man, he clearly exer-

cises his conscious freedom in a world of physical laws. He does not and cannot violate them, but he combines and turns them to his own ends, and this is what he is doing in all his use and mastery of nature. Physical energies have increasingly become his nimble servants, so that he hitches his wagons to the great golden driving wheel of the sun and rides in ease and comfort. He is wholly environed in a network of physical energies, and yet they no more fetter and impede him than does his own skin which constantly adapts itself without hindrance or friction to all his activities and aids him in them.

Man is not imprisoned in nature, but in a degree is its master. The universe with all its laws is his servant, and its powers bow to his personality at every step. Man is a supernatural being and moves through nature in the full possession and exercise of his freedom. Laws are the means of his liberty, the grooves and guides in which his liberty moves with smoothness and speed and safety. The steel track does not destroy the liberty of the locomotive, but gives it all the liberty it has. Law and liberty are not antagonistic but are mutually complementary and harmonious. It is because man lives in a world of law that he can have liberty and life.

Lotze wrote his monumental work, *Mikrokosmus,* to show "how absolutely universal is the extent, and at the same time how completely subordinate the significance, of the mission which mechanism has to fulfill in the structure of the world."[2] And A. J. Balfour, in his Gifford Lectures on *Theism and Humanism,* speaking of the difficulties in connection with natural law and prayer, says: "These difficulties are difficulties of theory, not of practice. They never disturb the ordinary man—nor the extraordinary man in his ordinary moments. Human intercourse is not embarrassed by the second, nor simple piety by the first. And perhaps the enlightened lounger, requesting a club waiter to shut the window, brushes aside, or ignores, as many philosophical puzzles as a mother passionately praying for the safety of her child." This view opens a wide door and makes plenty of room for incarnation, miracle, prayer, providence and all the supernatural elements and aspects of religion.

---

[2] Vol. I, p. 16.

Man, then, moves through the universe, and its laws are not weights but wings to his freedom and personality; and equally the ethical laws of his character are an expression and means of his liberty and life. Personality finds its proper field and exercise, not in caprice, but in plan and purpose; and thus the reign of law in the universe, instead of being an objection and fatal obstacle to the personality and freedom and obligation of man and the immortality of his soul and the providence of God in revelation and answer to prayer, is rather the necessary condition of these things.

(3) *Scientific Materialism.* From the earliest ages of human thinking on the deeper problems of the world, materialism has had advocates of ability who could put forward plausible facts and reasons for their theory, and it has always been regarded as fatal to ethics and religion, cutting up human freedom and responsibility by the roots. This theory has been strengthened in the popular view and practice by the enormous advances and spectacular achievements and triumphs of physical science. Yet something has happened to it in the higher regions of thought and its scarecrow has largely lost its power to create fright in the ethical and religious field.

The doctrine is of ancient lineage and respectability and was held by some Greek and Roman philosophers. The theory conceives that matter consists of very small particles of uniform hardness and impenetrability, size and nature, and that these are in a state of incessant motion, an infinite swarm of them filling all space. They strike and clash and cling together in larger bits and knots and masses and constitute all objects from microscopic molecules up to stones and stars. As beings grow more complex they are more highly organized aggregations of this primal matter. Life is a finer grade of such organization and the human brain itself is nothing other than the most complex and subtle organization of atoms that we know. Not only so, but our knowledge and affections and will, and the very soul itself, are only the combinations and activities of atoms. Out of dust we came and back to dust we go. Behavioristic psychology, the latest form of materialism, goes the whole length of the theory, denying that we know anything of a subjective consciousness and affirming that we know only bodily reactions. The theory needs only to be stated in this or in any

other form to see how absolutely destructive it is of all our supposed human worths and aspirations and dreams.

Let us not be surprised that men have held this theory, for it at first sight seems to be pressed upon us by the very facts of the world. We find that all physical things up to the human brain are combinations of matter and can be reduced to dust. The materialist will take us into a laboratory and show us a series of jars containing the whole human body analyzed into its elements with each element in its own jar and will say to us triumphantly, There you are!

However, few things are literally what they at first appear to be. There is no appearance that seems more certain than the revolution of the sun around the earth as we seem to see it with our very eyes. The whole world, including the scientists and philosophers, believed this for ages and any other belief seemed absurd. Yet we now know that the fact is the reverse of this appearance, and we need not be surprised to find other appearances turn out in the same way.

The fundamental difficulty that materialism has always encountered is that our consciousness seems indubitably to be of a different nature from moving and clashing atoms, however many and small and mysterious their nature and motions may be. We know the human brain, not only from the outside as so much highly organized matter, but also and more intimately and immediately from the inside as we are aware of the consciousness that is going on in connection with it. That there is some connection between the two is also an undoubted fact, but there is no thinkable way in which we can translate atomic motions into conscious thoughts. We have an external knowledge of matter through our senses and an immediate knowledge of our minds through intuition or direct awareness, and the two are disparate and cannot be brought together under one principle or kind.[3] The impossibility of thinking the passage from the one to the other has always been admitted

[3] That is, according to the view of matter held by materialism. Idealism, however, overcomes this difficulty by resolving matter into a form or manifestation of mind, and then the two are of one kind and can work together.

by eminent materialists, such as Tyndall, and this barrier stands to-day with no sign of yielding or being penetrated.

Behaviorism encounters this difficulty and has made no effort to overcome it. It simply bids us shut our inward eyes to the facts of consciousness while keeping our outer physical eyes open to bodily reactions. An eminent biologist has recently subjected this theory to a searching examination and shown its fallacy. The point he makes is that consciousness is forward-looking and purposive and thereby makes a difference in consequences that blind matter never could cause to come to pass. "The difference between men and magnets is certainly significant and not the least of these differences resides in the fact that human behavior is the expression of an organization one of whose manifestations is intelligence. The intelligence, with the related bodily changes (whether we know the latter or not), is therefore a real component of the human choice, and an essential component. The behavior would be different if it were not there. If I honestly do not believe that I am free to choose, it would appear that no amount of foreknowledge of possible future contingencies can lead to any possible modification of my behavior in view of this knowledge. I will passively await my fate with whatever of stoic calm I can command."[4]

So behaviorism when it falls into the hands of this biologist is tossed upon the scrap-heap of baseless theories and vagaries. It is obviously self-contradictory: for it uses consciousness to deny consciousness, consciousness first cutting its own throat and then loudly declaring that it is dead.[5]

Although this frontal resistance to materialism has not lost but gained in cogency as we know more about mind, yet the doctrine has suddenly found its bottom fallen out by an undermining attack upon its primary foundation, or by an unexpected and startling discovery of the nature of matter. Matter itself has dissolved

---

[4] "*Fatalism or Freedom, A Biologist's Answer,*" by Professor C. Judson Herrick, of the University of Chicago.

[5] For a keen and witty analysis and rejection of behaviorism and other forms of deterministic psychology, see an article on "The End of Ethics," by the English philosopher C. E. M. Joad in *Harper's Magazine* for July, 1927.

in the alembic of science. It was first broken up into molecules and these were divided into atoms which were long regarded as the ultimate indivisible and indestructible particles supposed to remain rigid and immutable as the last limit and final frontier of matter in all its forms.

But the atom itself has been shown to be a highly complex system subject to violent disintegration into simpler elements. The atom of radium, as an example of all atoms, is literally breaking up and expelling at great speed four streams of emanations, the débris of the exploding atom, the end product and final residuum of this atomic disintegration being lead, although theory supposes that lead also and all atoms are slowly undergoing the same dissolution. All atoms are now known to be composed of electrons and protons; these are particles very small as compared with the atom itself, and are bits of negative and positive electricity, the negative electrons revolving at a speed approaching that of light around the positive proton, or nucleus, composed of electrons and protons tightly locked together.

And what are electrons? They are believed to be some modification of the universal ether variously described as "vortexes," "strains," and "points of tension" in this medium. According to recent theory, propounded by Professor J. H. Jeans, the sun, along with all stars, in its fierce laboratory is transmuting electrons into heat and light, or waves of energy, and is thus radiating four million tons of its matter into space every second. If this theory is established, then matter and energy are proved to be identical. And what is the ether? We do not know, but it is declared to be "not matter,"[6] but a mysterious medium with very remarkable properties. Whatever it is, it acts as though it were pure force or undifferentiated energy, and energy is thus the very essence of the material universe.

Not only so, but this energy acts as though it were a universal will working according to plan and purpose. But will is known to us immediately as an attribute of consciousness and personality, and thus we find mind at the very bottom of the universe. The same result follows if in place of the ether we suppose, in accord-

[6] *Problems of Modern Science*, by B. H. Nicholson, p. 30.

ance with recent physics, that electrical waves of all kinds are pulses or quanta of energy shooting through space. The universe is thus energy acting according to plan, and such energy we immediately know in ourselves as will. By our will we move things and work out our purposes, and it is a step we can hardly escape taking to affirm that the universe is a vast or infinite Will. Along the same line of reasoning we reach the conclusion that the universe is the manifestation of an infinite Mind.

We are on the borders that lie between science and philosophy where we arrive at the essential spirituality of matter and of the universe itself. Not only philosophers but prominent physicists, reach the same conclusion at this point. Professor J. S. Haldane, of the University of Birmingham, an eminent authority in the field of science, devotes an article in *The Hibbert Journal* (April, 1923) to "the thesis that the material world which has been taken for a world of blind mechanism is in reality the spiritual world seen very partially and imperfectly, and that the only real world is the spiritual world." The whole outcome of recent science and philosophy is that matter as the basis of the old materialism has melted and dissolved into something very like spirit. As A. J. Balfour says, in his *Theism and Humanism,* "We now know too much about matter to be materialists."

This at once frees the external world from the iron-bound mechanism of matter that had no room for mind and freedom and responsibility and smothered the personality of both God and man and left only a strangled and dead universe without permanent worth or any hope, and transmutes it into a roomy and friendly world for the dwelling and education and exercise of all the powers and aspirations of the human soul and opens out infinite vistas for endless life in the world beyond. The old materialism is dead and should frighten us no more.

The specter of a universe burning up into an ash-heap and cinder-pile over which floats the dread flag of extinction has been replaced with the green mountain top of a far new world, that "one, far-off, divine event to which the whole creation moves."

Thus the old faith need not be afraid of the new knowledge in the field of science: it can receive it and build it into its own temple, and this is modernism. The most eminent scientists themselves

say this, and their word increases our assurance. Sir Oliver Lodge, who speaks as a physicist of recognized authority, in an address delivered in March, 1926, said: "I tell you that the universe is great and splendid beyond our imagination. Let us not take a pitiful mean outlook. Nothing is too great or too good to be true. We cannot imagine things better than they are. The more you penetrate into the secrets of nature, the more overwhelmed you are with wonder, love and praise. Our present existence on this planet is but an episode, a temporary adventure to be followed by higher and further adventures. Do not fear; fear is torment. Perfect love casteth out fear. The universe is ruled by perfect love. That is my message."[7] And an equally eminent American physicist assures us: "We can still look with a sense of wonder and mystery and reverence upon the fundamental elements of the physical world as they have been partially revealed to us in this century."[8]

2. In the Field of Philosophy

Philosophy changes more slowly than science as it seeks to penetrate below surface waves to stiller depths, but it also is subject to the principle of modernism and adapts itself to current thought as it must incorporate all new knowledge in its system. Yet necessarily what may appear to be new philosophy often turns out to be new forms of old thought. It will be sufficient to indicate briefly some of the current forms of philosophy as they bear on the field of faith. We have already considered scientific materialism which passes into philosophic materialism and need not be further considered.

(1) *Agnosticism.* Agnosticism holds that we cannot know the nature of ultimate reality, or of any reality in itself, but can know only its phenomenal appearances. These appearances are said to be unlike the ultimate reality and act as a screen or bar to shut us off from it. The constitution of the human mind is such that its senses and categories, or intuitional principles, are interposed as a medium that perverts reality, just as a lens of colored glass

[7] Quoted by Robert F. Horton in *The Capacity for God*, p. 248.

[8] *Evolution in Science and Religion*, by Robert A. Millikan, p. 27.

not only colors all the objects seen through it but also may magnify or minimize their true size and utterly distort their true shape. This theory of the human mind was variously stated by Hume and Kant and Hamilton and Spencer, but in all its forms it conceives the mind to be an organ that cannot give us a true but only a relative knowledge of objective reality. Mr. Spencer in his *Principles of Psychology* gives us a diagram of a curved lens that distorts a cube seen through it into a radically grotesque shape, and this illustrates his view of the working of the human mind in the perception of reality. The outcome of this doctrine of the relativity of knowledge is that our mind out of its own constitution forms conceptions of reality that bear no resemblance to its true nature; and thus we are shut up within our mind and can never reach reality. As applied to God this theory gives us the Unknowable of Mr. Spencer and the Absolute of Mr. Bradley. It writes "Unknowable" across the mystery of the universe and turns it into a monstrous stone Sphinx whose lips are forever sealed as to any God or hope for us. All religious faith is torn up by the roots and immortality finds no gleam of light in this system.

However, things have gone hard with this system of despair in the higher fields of philosophy and it has largely lost its terror. Several lines of thought lead to this conclusion.

(*a*) In spite of his own agnostic principle Mr. Spencer proceeds to write ten volumes of *Synthetic Philosophy*, every page of which tells us something about this Unknowable Power, for he is all the way through unfolding the laws of its operations. It thus turns out that he is rich as Crœsus in practical knowledge of his Unknowable Power. As Leslie Stephen said to him, "You know entirely too much about your Unknowable." And Mr. Bradley, in spite of his destructive criticism of the human mind as an organ of knowledge, writes his large volume on *Appearance and Reality* and is equally inconsistent.

(*b*) Agnosticism is equally fatal to all knowledge, including its own principle and system. If the human mind is fundamentally an untrustworthy and perversive organ of knowledge, then it cannot truly know anything, not even that it cannot know. Such denial of knowledge must deny its own denial and thereby cancel

itself. Agnosticism literally commits suicide and then strangely keeps on talking.

(*c*) There is an element of truth in agnosticism, as there is in all theories and even in all error however far astray it may be, and it is this grain of truth in error that gives it its plausibility and vitality. The truth in agnosticism is that the human mind cannot penetrate into and grasp reality in its whole nature, but can know only in part. All our knowledge at its utmost bound is only an infinitesimal fraction of reality and is soon lost in the impenetrable mystery of the simplest fact. Even to know a "flower in the crannied wall," "root and branch and all in all" would be to "know what God and man is." Nevertheless, the mind is a true instrument of knowledge as far as its powers go. It knows its own consciousness, not through the media of senses, but by intuition, or immediate awareness, and this is knowledge not of phenomena but of noumena, or reality itself. And in and through phenomena the mind knows noumena, or ultimate reality, as far as its knowledge goes. For the appearances of things are so far the things themselves or are the effects of them and disclose their activities and laws, and thus the mind goes beyond appearances into the nature of things in so far as it discerns the ideas and laws embedded in them. Idealism holds that the mind penetrates into the very inner nature of an object as an activity of thought and feeling and will and finds that it is a mental object or spirit of like nature with itself. The mind is thus shown to be a trustworthy organ of knowledge and is saved from the pit of universal agnosticism.

(*d*) The human mind can, therefore, know God so far as its finite capacity can grasp or catch a glimpse of the infinite. Mr. Spencer himself declares that the existence of the Unknowable Power is the most certain fact of our knowledge—another self-contradiction in his agnosticism—and he even hazards the venture that it is "probably psychical" and "hyperpersonal" in nature. It is only going a logical step further to affirm that the mind can gain some true knowledge of the infinite, and it finds the Ultimate Reality and First Cause of all things to be Spirit and a personal God. While our knowledge of God is limited by our finite capacities and contains much symbolism, so that God is still

in a degree the "agnostic God," according to the Greek inscription Paul saw on the statue of a god in Athens, yet He is also truly known to us in His nature and constitution as the Father of our spirits, in Whom we live and move and have our being. The knowledge of God is indeed "too wonderful for us; it is high, we cannot attain unto it." The Bible is full of such agnosticism; our knowledge of God is only as an infant's knowledge of its father, or its babble of books in a great library, yet is real knowledge as far as it goes, and it goes far enough to enable us to live with God in ever-growing fellowship. Philosophic agnosticism has thus rendered some real service in the field of faith, but it has been deprived of its power to frighten us.

(2) *Pantheism.* Pantheism affirms the reality of one eternal substance which is forever evolving into the temporary aspects of the world. Spinoza held that there is one infinite substance with an unknown number of attributes of which we know two, thought and extension, the one being mind and the other matter. This unitary substance comes to consciousness in mind and extends itself spatially in matter, and thus we have the two fundamental aspects of the world we experience. The one eternal substance, however, has consciousness only in man and in any other finite minds that may exist, but is itself unconscious and impersonal. Impersonality is the deepest root of pantheism. The impersonal substance also unfolds into its temporal manifestations by necessity, and again we are caught in the coils of a fatalistic system. "The disposition which commonly governs the pantheistic imagination," says Lotze, is "the suppression of all that is finite in favor of the Infinite, the inclination to regard all that is of value to the living soul as transitory, empty, and frail in comparison of the majesty of the One, upon whose formal properties of immensity, unity, eternity, and inexhaustible fullness it concentrates all its reverence."

This system is of very ancient lineage and reappears in many modern forms, such as deterministic monism, Mr. H. G. Wells' *God the Invisible King*, and probably in Bergson's *Creative Evolution*. All forms of materialism, including much of the current "behaviorism" in psychology, fall into this pit.

Of course, there is a great truth embodied in pantheism. This

truth is the unity of all things and that in God we live and move and have our being, a truth that has been enormously expanded and illuminated by our modern knowledge. But this truth must be carefully discriminated from and guarded against the impersonality and determinism that sink and smother all things in a common sea of unconsciousness and fate.

The outcome of this system of thought is that all the myriad aspects of the world are mere illusions, richly colored bubbles on the ocean of the infinite that for an instant flash their iridescence and then burst, or are waves that for a moment rise and display the gleam of their white fangs, and then bubble and wave sink back into the depths of oblivion. Pantheism is as fatal to the reality of our human personality as it is to that of the infinite substance, for reduces it to one of the illusions of the world. It is equally fatal to all free will and responsibility, worthy character and conduct, for these, too, are determined as certainly as the wind and waves. In such a system "everything is God but God himself."

The God of pantheism raises a dread specter which paralyzes life with hopelessness and despair. For it is "an immense solitary specter—it has no shape, it has no sound, it has no place, it has no time. It is, and was, and will be, it is never more nor less, nor glad nor sad. Its name is Nothingness—and the sands fall down in the hour glass, and the shadows sweep around the dial, and men alone wake and sleep, forget and love and hate and know it." In such a world there is no room for true life and love, faith and hope, for all these are the strangled children of our illusion and delusion. This fatalistic impersonality of pantheism is its own deepest and surest condemnation. Our hearts, in which eternity has been set, cry out against it as fatherless and motherless children cry in the night. Our deepest constitution and most urgent needs must have their appropriate satisfaction and refuse to receive stone for bread.

(3) *Personalism.* Personality is the only adequate explanation of the universe. We are disposed to think we have discovered the explanation of a fact when we have traced it to some law or fitted it as a link or a cog into a mechanical system; and we further seem to think that such an explanation rules out God; for, as some one has said, when we discover how a thing was done our first conclusion is that God did not do it.

But this explanation only moves effects back a step and ultimately explains nothing. Such a system cannot begin itself or order its plan or supply its energy. We immediately know order and plan only in our own intelligence and will, and then we proceed to extend and apply these inner principles to external things. We look upon human behavior as it goes on in business, politics, art, literature, religion, upon the whole swarming ant-hill of our human world, and we infer in these moving bodies the presence and activity of souls like our own. The whole human spectacle is meaningless until we thus interpret it, and personality instantly lights it up with this inner power and explanation.

An extension of the same principle puts intelligence and will behind and within all the appearances and activities of the universe as its inner reason and energy. We can really understand these activities only when we interpret their order and plan as the work of intelligence and their energies as the exertion of will. The universe also, like our human world, is rationally understood only as we interpret it in terms of personality; and then personality becomes our ultimate explanation which cannot be explained but must be accepted as at once the initial and the final fact of existence, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end; an Infinite Mystery, it is true, but a final mystery that swallows up and explains all other mysteries.

The immanence of God is thus the rational groundwork and cause of the universe, launching it into existence and acting as its inner intelligence and will that constantly sustain it and give it all its order and plan and purpose, energy and activity, beauty and joy and blessedness, and coming to its highest expression in finite beings, so far as we know, in our human world. This is the final and only adequate explanation of the universe and in it we rest.

How is this view affected by our modernism? Of course, it is subject to the principle of modernism and must absorb and assimilate all our modern knowledge and experience in every field. No atom of fact can be refused admittance to the temple of philosophy and must be fitted harmoniously into its structure. Personalism stands ready to receive all facts and build them into its system. Astronomy cannot stretch its spaces beyond its limits, or physics find an electron too small for a worthy place in its plan. Psy-

chology and ethics and art, poetry and religion and all the glorious capacities and achievements of the human soul will find a congenial home in its spiritual world. Immortality is crowned with its supreme hope in this home, and God himself dwells in its light unapproachable and full of glory. All our modern light only the more clearly outlines this spacious world and fills it with worthy meaning and grander visions. Personal theism dissolves the whole universe into the splendor of God. It takes the stones of the universe that science to some minds seems to tear down into ruins and rebuilds them into a veritable city of God which is a worthy habitation for all spirits and for God Himself.

Our modern world has a great hunger for such a world-view. The old scoffing infidelity is no longer respectable and is discredited and gone. Modern science has grown serious, and philosophy reverent and worshipful. Agnosticism itself is bitten with this spiritual hunger. Materialism pants for spiritual breath. Huxley and Spencer among the older thinkers of our day, and James and Wells and Bergson among the more recent, look wistfully for some city of God. They strain their eyes to catch some gleam of gates ajar through which may come some light of faith and hope. Theistic philosophy is not the enemy but the friend of faith, and in the light of modernism it is becoming more friendly and helpful.

The broad central current of philosophic thought flowing down through the centuries has not been materialistic or pantheistic or agnostic, but has been and is idealistic. It issued from the Ideas of Plato and in modern times has found varied expression in Berkeley, Kant, Hegel, Ward, Bergson, Bosanquet, Bowne, Royce, Hoernle, not to extend, much less exhaust, the list.[9] It is not claimed that these thinkers always keep within the orbit of Christian thought or even religious demands, but they sweep around the center of a theistic and personalistic universe and often come close to it. At times they may seem far off from it and at other times they come unexpectedly near. Bernard Bosanquet, one of

[9] The literature of idealistic philosophy is large and a recent illuminating exposition of it is *Idealism as a Philosophy,* by R. F. Hoernle, formerly professor of philosophy at Harvard. Another able statement of it is *The Philosophy of Personalism,* by Professor Albert C. Knudson, of Boston University.

the profoundest of recent English philosophers, in his early writings was unfriendly to Christian ideas and bitterly hostile to the church, but in his later writings he had learned to appreciate the service of the church and even approached the cross of Christ. He makes this striking confession, with which we close this section of our discussion:

> When critical ideas directed against current orthodox Christianity first made an impression on my mind, it was more than anything else the doctrine of vicarious atonement, literally construed, that seemed shocking and unjust. And it was with some interest, and not without surprise, that, taking stock of one's convictions after a long development, one found that what was obviously the intention of the doctrine in question, so far from remaining the great stumbling-block of Christianity, had become pretty nearly its sole attractive feature. One had passed, I suppose, from an individualistic rationalism to an appreciation of the world of spiritual membership.[10]

3. In the Field of Religion

Religion is necessarily, though it may be slowly and insensibly, affected by the intellectual and social, moral and spiritual climate of its time; it gradually conforms to the thought-molds of its day. This is true of the most intensely and fiercely fundamentalist religion as well as of the extreme modernist forms of faith. If we compare the most orthodox types of Christianity to-day with the orthodoxy of five hundred or even of fifty years ago we shall see these climatic changes and the farther back we go the greater the departures of the new faith from the old. The most extreme and vociferous fundamentalist of to-day would have been haled before an ecclesiastical court and perhaps burnt at the stake if he had turned up in Rome in the tenth or been caught in Geneva in the sixteenth century.

(1) *General Effects.* Modernism has pervaded and colored all forms of faith to-day, but in very different degrees. The fundamentalist may be quite unaware of his modernism, and yet he accepts modern astronomy and much modern science and some of the modern views of Biblical criticism and Christian doctrine. Few of them now interpret many things in the Bible with rigid and sheer

---

[10] *The Value and Destiny of the Individual*, p. 147.

literalism. Even the Roman Catholic Church has been influenced by modernism and is a different church to-day from what it was at the Reformation, and the Eastern Orthodox Church has been modified and mollified to-day in comparison with what it was when the Patriarch of Alexandria kicked to death the Patriarch of Constantinople and thereby proved his own orthodoxy. The fundamentalist may be quite comfortable with his modernism as long as he does not know it is modernism. Ignorance is often bliss, and unconscious inconsistency is a means of comfort with us all.

But among those who accept the name and apply the principle of modernism in religion there are wide degrees of variance. There are right and left wings in both fundamentalism and modernism. Many modernists are orthodox evangelicals, but others are far out on the radical left wing of natural religion and deny all miracles and supernatural elements in any religion. With such modernism we have no sympathy. However, let us keep in mind that modernism is not properly a system of belief but a method of study and a process of determining belief. The same principle and process may lead one thinker towards the right and another towards the left wing in their conclusions, and the principle may be the same, however the conclusions differ.

Modernism has gone farther in England and on the Continent than it has in our country. In England there is an organized party of clergymen and laymen in the Anglican Church who form "The Church Union" and have as their organ *The Modern Churchmen,* and their modernism is of the extreme type. The Congregationalists of England also held, in June, 1927, their Oxford Conference "to consider the Christian Faith in the Light of Modern Science and Criticism," which was the outcome of a challenge issued the year before by an article in the *Congregational Quarterly* by Dr. R. F. Horton to the effect that "the Free Churches should face the issues raised by the impact of science and critical scholarship upon the traditional beliefs of the church, and that an attempt should be made to set forth the centralities of the faith in the full light of modern research." At this conference able papers were read by eminent scholars dealing with various phases of the problem. The Presbyterians of Scotland have gone farther in their liberalism than have the Presbyterians of America. On the Con-

tinent modernism is rather more elastic and liberal than in England and Scotland. "Lutheran and Reformed theology, representing the two main currents of Continental theology, vary from strict denominational orthodoxy to extreme liberalism. A synthesis between the maintenance of the fundamentals of historic doctrine and the assured results of modern methods is represented in modern positive theology, whose strongest exponent is Seeberg of Berlin. There is no doubt that Continental orthodoxy has shown more elasticity in the interpretation of the old doctrines and in the assimilation of critical methods than American orthodoxy." [11]

Our American churches, like those of Europe, show different degrees of response to the modern spirit, though all of them, even the Roman Catholic, have been affected in some measure however insensibly and unconsciously. The Protestant Episcopalian and the Congregational communions among orthodox bodies have yielded most freely to liberal tendencies and views and have experienced little strain and no dissension. Denominations that have divided into Northern and Southern branches, such as the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians, are more conservative in the South than in the North. The Southern Baptists are strongly fundamentalistic, but the Northern Baptists, with an aggressive fundamentalist party among them, have been increasingly dominated by a more liberal element, and the same statement holds for the Southern and the Northern Presbyterians. The Northern Methodists have almost wholly escaped controversial discussion of this issue and are predominantly liberal.

There are militant fundamentalists of the extreme type in practically all denominations and they have their organs and organizations. These are at times a disturbing element, but they are less so than formerly as by their methods and spirit they are losing ground. They have a National Fundamentalist Association which has put out a Fundamentalist Creed consisting of nine articles. With the exception of the one on premillenarianism, these would be accepted by most liberals, though, no doubt, with differences of expression and interpretation. The fundamentalists also, in ad-

---

[11] *Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook.* By Adolf Keller and George Stewart, Chapter XVI on "The Changing Theological Front."

dition to their endeavors to prohibit by state legislation the teaching of evolution in tax-supported schools, a movement that has succeeded in only two or three Southern states and appears to have reached its limit, have or are now (1927) organizing two fundamentalist universities, the Bryan Memorial University, appropriately located at Dayton, Tennessee, and the Des Moines University, recently taken over by the fundamentalist Baptists at Des Moines, Iowa. These universities are tied up in their charters and by-laws and pledges exacted of trustees and professors so as rigidly to exclude any form of modernism, especially evolution. The standing of such institutions in popular opinion, and especially in the scholarly world, is yet to be seen.

However, as modernism is not a system of belief or a party with a platform, but a principle and process, it is a pervasive spirit working gradually and silently and slowly percolating through all fields of thought and life. Its effect cannot always be measured by visible results and statistical methods but is rather felt in atmospheric changes which do not come with observation and can be appreciated only at considerable intervals of time. This atmospheric influence of modernism is its strength and promise of victory as it affects men of all classes, even the most conservative and fanatically fundamentalistic, so that even such extreme men may be modernists in some points and not know it, just as the character in the French play had been speaking prose all his life and was surprised to find it out. This is the hopeful fact in this field of the relation of old faith and new knowledge. Often controversy over the subject, while sometimes necessary, yet tends to breed partisan dissension and strife, and this does not usually help but hinders the growth of truth. Slower methods and a gentler spirit are better and in time work deeper and more lasting changes, even as the balmy breath of spring melts the icy fetters of the winter and brings forth the bloom and fruitage of the summer.

(2). *Special Effects.* In time these changes accumulate into results that mark evident progress and are generally accepted, as we have already seen has frequently happened in the past, and we venture to indicate some of the results of the modern spirit that have won their way to acceptance among our evangelical churches

to-day, although we are aware there will be differences of view about these points.

(*a*) *Biblical Criticism.* The right to study the Bible by the most rigorous scientific methods to find out so far as possible the truth as to its origin and authorship has been established. It can claim no special favors on the ground of its divine sacredness and inspiration, but must submit to the same laws of investigation as other books. Any other view of the book is no longer respected and it is conceded by all competent students worthy of the name.

What results have been established by this process so as to win general acceptance is another question about which there are wide differences of view among those who accept the general principle. But even as to conclusions the old views of the origin and authorship of the books of the Bible have undergone considerable reconstruction in conservative quarters. Few now think that Moses wrote the Pentateuch including the account of his own death, and other such changes have gradually worked their way into general acceptance.

As illustration and proof of this a single instance may be adduced. In 1893 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. found the Rev. Professor Charles A. Briggs guilty of "erroneous teachings, views and doctrines" which "strike at the vitals of religion" and suspended him from the Presbyterian ministry. Among these "teachings" was specified the theory held by Dr. Briggs that there were two Isaiahs. At the opening of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1922 the retiring Moderator took as the text of his sermon a passage from Isaiah and his first sentence was, "Whether there were two Isaiahs or not is probably a question of little importance to most of us. There was at least one," and proceeded to preach his sermon. This opening remark did not create a ripple of surprise and probably few in the Assembly noted its significance or thought there was anything strange about it. And yet it marked a revolution in the Presbyterian Church that had silently taken place in the thirty-one years that had elapsed since that very view had been officially condemned as an error that was adjudged to "strike at the vitals of religion." The fact is that the teachings of Dr. Briggs on the subject of Biblical criticism are now taught in

practically all standard theological seminaries and nobody thinks anything about it. Time settles some things that controversy only inflames and quietly erases some judicial decisions of ecclesiastical courts.

(*b*) *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture.* The general acceptance of the principles and at least of some of the results of Biblical criticism inevitably works changes in the more difficult and vital question of Scripture inspiration and authority. This is a more subjective matter than the objective study of the historical origin of the Bible and cannot be so definitely formulated. No historical creed has drawn up a formal definition of inspiration and this doctrine is still in a more or less fluid condition. The old doctrine of absolute inerrancy has been hard, if not impossible, to defend and has been abandoned by some eminent fundamentalists, as we have already seen.

That changes have gradually crept over the views of Scripture formerly held and have infiltrated through all Christian communions is evidenced by many signs in many quarters. As illustration and proof of this we adduce an article that appeared in the April, 1927, issue of an extremely orthodox review published by a thoroughly orthodox theological institution. The article is entitled "The Authority of Biblical Truth," and is by the Rev. Dr. S. D. Chown, a minister of the United Church of Canada, and it appeared in *The Biblical Review* published by "The Biblical Seminary in New York." We quote from it the following passage:

> Fifty years ago or thereabouts students for the ministry began their study of the Christian Scriptures with the prepossession, that the collection of writings included in the Protestant Bible was made by God Himself and given to men with the warning, that, under penalty of losing their share in the tree of life and in the Holy City, they must not add to nor take away from its contents. In every part and in every letter the supposed claim of the Bible to perfect infallibility was conceded. Those who wrote it were simply the instruments of the Holy Spirit who Himself guided the pen of each writer to the exclusion of all error, historical or spiritual. There may have been some exceptional cases, but such was the mental attitude of the ordinary student at that time to what he unhesitatingly called the Word of God. The Bible was the final authority from which neither conscience nor reason had any appeal. To make an attempt to show the palpable impossibility of intelligent belief in such a proposition would in the end be a barren victory because confidence is not in the infallibility of any trans-

lation now in use, but in that of an ancient text which is quite inaccessible to those who profess to believe it. In his study of the letters of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, the student soon found that these potential saints were exhorted to judge for themselves and to prove all things. "I speak as to wise men," said Paul; "judge ye what I say."

Dr. Chown goes on to show that Luther and Calvin and other Reformers rested the authority of the Bible "upon its re-creative power, not its literary infallibility," upon "its intrinsic character" and "the inward witness of the Spirit." This is where the Westminster standards rest the Bible as "the rule of faith and life." "Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts."

The Bible does the work of a divinely inspired book and on this rock its spiritual truth and authority stand secure apart from questions of scientific and literary accuracy. Many fundamentalists stake the whole inspiration and value of the Scriptures and the very gospel itself upon the absolute inerrancy of the Bible, but so conservative a theologian and strong tower of orthodoxy as Dr. Francis L. Patton declares this to be "foolish."

(*c*) *Systematic Theology.* Theology like any other science tends to fall behind the progress of thought and get out of date and from time to time must be revised and reconstructed. If we compare any standard work on systematic theology of fifty or seventy-five years ago with one of to-day we see how much theological water has flowed under the bridge during this interval and what a different aspect the science now wears. Without indicating specific changes it may be noted that theology is less dogmatic in method and temper and more scientific, and, in fact, the name "dogmatic theology" once current has almost disappeared from theological literature. "Dogmatic chemistry" or "dogmatic biology" would not sound well. Theology is also less metaphysical and speculative and more concrete and keeps closer to the ground of known truth, and especially is it less presumptive in assuming a kind of omniscience of divine things; it knows less and is more agnostic than it was formerly. There is a large element, as we have seen, of religious agnosticism in the Bible and this has invaded and modified theology. The old air of omniscience has practically disappeared from our

systematic theology and theologians now seldom rush in where angels fear to tread but have grown strikingly modest and reticent. They know that they know far less than the fathers thought they knew, and yet they have immensely wider knowledge and may have a truer and richer faith. All science in the midst of its splendid achievements is really growing more aware of its limits, and of its ignorance incomparably vaster than its knowledge, and this makes it more modest and humble; and this modernistic spirit is invading and reshaping our theology.

Another point at which change has come over our modern theology is the shift in emphasis from the transcendence to the immanence of God. Formerly the sovereignty of God was pressed so far as to approach fatalism, which is the tendency of divine transcendence, and the tendency of the divine immanence is to pass into pantheism. Either of these views is intolerable to our thought, for each is a lions' den where all human tracks go in and none come out. We must find some mode of combining both into unity. This unity is reached in the idealistic conception of the world as a spiritual system which is the life of God, His eternal employment and enjoyment. The world is immanent in God and God is immanent in the world, somewhat as our thoughts are immanent in our consciousness and yet our personal self is distinct from our immanent ideas. God is in the world and the world is in God, and yet while immanent in it He is also transcendent over it. This turns the universe into His spiritual presence and life and He is everywhere closer to us than breathing, nearer than hands and feet. "Earth's crammed with heaven, and every common bush afire with God." "There are no Gentile oaks, no pagan pines." The Bible itself is full of this divine immanence, and the doctrine is simply a grand exposition of Paul's principle, "In him we live, and move, and have our being." This mutual immanence of the divine and human eludes our power to trace its boundaries and operations, but it is a fundamental fact in our philosophical and theological conceptions of the relations of God and the world and has pervaded much of our religious thought and experience.

> Draw if thou canst the mystic line,
> Severing rightly His from thine,
> Which is human, which divine.
>
> —*Emerson.*

All this brings God very near to us and makes him "our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."

(*d*) *Credal Revision.* A creed or credal revision, as we have seen, is a precipitate from a state of strain in which the old faith has fallen so far behind the new knowledge that the tension threatens disruption and calls for a revised or new statement. This process has gone on from the beginning of religious history and will go on to the end of time.

It falls within our present purpose only to note this process as it is going on to-day. The Anglican Church has just carried through such a revision. Its Prayer Book dated from 1662 and it was high time that it should be adjusted to modern thought and life. There are three parties in the church, the Anglo-Catholics, the Evangelicals and the Modernists, and all three were increasingly dissatisfied and restless. At length the matter was committed to the Bishops and they produced a revised Prayer Book which was submitted to Convocation and then passed on to Parliament for final approval. Here, having passed the Lords, it met with unexpected rejection in the Commons and is now (February 1928) being further considered and revised by the Bishops. It is expected that it will yet pass Parliament and become the lawful book of the Church. The tension for revision pressed with different degrees at different points, but one of the objectives of the movement was "to accept the assured results of Biblical criticism and to recognize the implications of modern science." The revised Book contains a large number of changes, many of them of small significance, but all together they amount to a general reconstruction of it without impairing either its essential Protestantism or its evangelical doctrine. One of the changes that created the most popular interest, both for and against it, is the omission of the word "obey" in the marriage service, but obviously this is a minor matter. Without going into a detailed statement of even the more important changes, the revision shows that the process of credal expression is still going on and its object is to bring the creed up to date in accordance with the method and spirit of modernism.

In Canada the union of the Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist churches into the United Church of Canada called for the framing of an entire new creed and polity, and this large and

difficult undertaking was carried through with surprising harmony and resulted in an evangelical creed that is sound in faith and admirable in expression, and is modern in all respects.

In our own country, the Presbyterians are the most strictly credal church and are perhaps most jealous of their theological system, and yet they have yielded to the pressure for credal revision. The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has repeatedly revised its standards as in 1788 and in 1887. But it generally remodeled its Book of Discipline in 1884, and in 1903 it carried to completion a notable revision of its Confession of Faith. By a Declaratory Statement it modified the harsh and forbidding and apparently fatalistic features, that had so long given offense, of Chapter III on "God's Eternal Decree," and of Chapter X dealing with the salvation of infants dying in infancy, and it added two entirely new chapters, XXXIV and XXXV, on "The Holy Spirit" and on "The Love of God." The Declaratory Statement relieved the Confession of its dark and repellent aspects and the new chapters broadened and brightened it by shedding over the whole Confession the splendor of the universal love of God.

The United Presbyterian Church has done a still more notable thing. This church is naturally one of the most conservative branches of the Presbyterian family, but it has recently written a wholly new Confession of Faith. The avowed object of this undertaking was to modernize the old Confession so as to express its doctrine and language in the terms of to-day. The church felt that it could keep its place in the modern world and could hold its own people and especially its young people only by a new creed in a new garb. Its new Confession is an admirable piece of work and refutes the obstructive saying that "this is not a creed writing age." This age can write a creed as well as any age when it has something to say, and the United Presbyterian Church felt that it had something to say and it did say it and said it wisely and well. The old Confession is still retained along with the new, but in case of divergence the new is given supremacy over the old.

The communions that do not have written creeds, such as the Baptists and Disciples, do not have to go through the birth-pangs of revision, but they are none the less subject and adjust themselves

to the same conditions that require living religious faith to keep pace with growing knowledge.

The question of credal subscription comes up in connection with creeds, and this sometimes becomes an acute and difficult point. As the creed falls behind current belief subscription begins to bind and then grows increasingly difficult. As a rule, subscription is required only of ministers and sometimes in a stricter degree of theological professors. Some creeds have been made so specific and rigid as to leave no room for elasticity and varying beliefs and these in time become intolerable, and then they must be revised or else signed with such reservations as raise ethical questions. However, some creeds contain provisions for interpretation that permits growth in knowledge and personal adjustment. This is notably true of the Westminister Form of Government which requires of ministers that they "sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." This "system of doctrine" is necessarily subject to individual interpretation as no official interpretation of it could be adopted unless it were incorporated in the constitution itself. Presbyteries and higher judicatories may interpret it in individual cases, but such decisions apply only to the particular case and cannot be erected into a general law.[12]

(*e*) *The Social Gospel.* The social gospel is simply the old gospel that was preached and applied tremendously by the Hebrew prophets and by our Lord and his apostles and that has come down through the centuries to us. It is the living gospel as carried into character and conduct and applied to all problems, individual and social, moral and industrial, educational and political, national and international, of our own time. It especially seeks to reconstruct

[12] In 1909 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. adopted the following declaration: "That ministers, ruling elders and deacons, in expressing approval of the Westminster Confession of Faith as revised in 1903, are required to assent only to the system of doctrine contained therein, and not to every particular statement in it. . . Whether a 'particular statement' in the Confession of Faith constitutes an essential part of the 'system of doctrine' can be determined authoritatively only by the General Assembly. *Minutes of the General Assembly,* New Series, Vol. IX, pp. 176-177. See also Third Series, Vol. VI, 1927, p. 81.

the social order in accordance with Christian ideas and ideals. It looks into everything from prisons and mills to banks and Senate chambers, from the police to the President, into work and wages, capital and labor, law and order, righteousness and justice, and leaves no nook unvisited and no problem without attempting its solution. Especially does it seek to right wrongs and reconstruct the social order so as to give equitable opportunity to all, not so much by legislation as by inculcating and urging Christian ideas and diffusing a Christian spirit.

The social gospel has greatly influenced our theology and especially our preaching. It has taken our theology out of the cloistered seclusion of the theological seminary and brought it into vital contact with the real world of life, with its poverty and wrongs, sufferings and sorrows, tears and tragedies, and forced it to become human and practical in its doctrines and applications. And it has humanized and practicalized the pulpit by bringing its doctrines and sermons down out of theoretical skies to the common earth where people live. Sermons no longer have as their main object the proving of some theological proposition but the helping of human beings. The preacher is not posing before his people and going through a performance, but has his eye on their hearts and homes and business and is endeavoring to see through their eyes and to encourage and inspire them with his message and his contagious spirit.

While this social gospel is old and no modern novelty, yet from time to time, like theology and creeds, it falls out of touch with its day, lags behind the changing social order and needs to be recast and brought up to date. Preaching to-day is in much closer connection with human needs and, therefore, is more practical and helpful and also more interesting than formerly, and this illustrates the principle of modernism.

(*f*) *The Kingdom of God.* We may note one other point in the religious modernism of our day and that is the waning of sectarianism and the growing idea and dominance of the kingdom of God. Formerly sectarianism not only cut our common Christianity into separate bodies but set these bodies in rivalry and strife with one another. They had little common work or even fellowship and were frequently in open hostility, but now all this is practically gone

and in most quarters is no longer tolerable. Protestantism has reached the practical unity of the spirit with its universal fellowship and coöperation, and its Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, embracing about thirty denominations, is a visible organ of unity and coöperative work. Protestantism has also recently held two world conferences of great significance and hope, The World Conference on Christian Life and Work at Stockholm in August, 1925, and The World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in August, 1927. It is true that Rome was not officially present at either of these conferences, but they were forward steps and may prove to be as significant as any event in the Christian world since the Reformation. Even Protestantism and Roman Catholicism and the Greek Orthodox Church are drawing together in better relations of mutual respect and fellowship. Official representatives of the latter Church were present at the Lausanne Conference.

Thus we are no longer building competitive denominational churches but are building the kingdom of God on earth. No church now thinks the gospel is shut up within its own walls, but all churches have a world vision. This is now our great common task. We are building that city which John saw coming down out of heaven upon the earth. Already we are rearing its jeweled walls around our horizon and laying its golden pavements under our feet. This is the meaning and objective of all our work and worship, education, missions at home and abroad. We are carrying out the Great Commission and are Christianizing the world. The task is immense and it is yet only barely begun and glimpsed by us, but it takes great things to match and challenge our great powers. Only some great majestic vision can lift us out of our little lives and petty programs and rivalries and jealousies up to a great mountain top where we can see all the world waiting for us and can swell with a new sense of the greatness and grandeur of our calling and opportunity and lose our lives in the life that is hid with Christ in God.

(*g*) *Practical Results.* "By their fruits ye shall know them." To this test must every principle and process come. What are the practical fruits of modernism? Does it devitalize the gospel and render the pulpit impotent? What preachers are most effective

in presenting the gospel and saving souls, modernists or fundamentalists? Does modernism cut the nerve of missions? Does it lower the level of Christian life and let in a flood of worldliness? Especially, what effect does it have in college and university circles? Does it turn them into hotbeds of infidelity? Do they receive our young people out of Christian homes and send them back bereft of Christian faith as unbelievers and agnostics? Are students in these institutions under its influence forming atheist clubs and calling themselves by such names as "Damned Souls" and committing suicide? These are serious charges and some fundamentalists are outspoken and unsparing in laying the burden of these evils at the door of modernism. No doubt, modernism has its share in the complex conditions and causes that bring about such results, as all progress in truth and in all fields is attended with some loss and pain.

However, before coming to any conclusion at this point we would need first to inquire how far these pessimistic pictures are true and whether they are not greatly overdrawn and exaggerated, and whether the whole course of affairs is not distinctly better to-day than it was yesterday and is gradually moving in the right direction. We would also need further to cast up the ill consequences of fundamentalism before we could balance the books.

As to the gospel, the only vital gospel is the true gospel, and whatever pours new light upon it and adjusts it into harmony with our present knowledge does not devitalize but invigorates it. If we preached the gospel to-day just as it was preached by the early Church Fathers it would fall dead from our lips. Modernism keeps it alive.

As to the efficiency of preaching, this depends in no small degree on the personality of the preacher. Orthodoxy appears to have little to do with the success of preaching. One preacher may be superlatively orthodox and yet be so intolerably dull and dry that people fly from his presence; another preacher may be radically heretical and yet the people cannot get in to hear him. The theory that if a minister only preaches the orthodox gospel the Lord is sure to bless him is a pious fiction that is disproved in many an empty church. There are outstanding preachers among both modernists and fundamentalists, but it is not their type of theology

that makes them great preachers, but their genius. Billy Sunday is a fundamentalist of his own peculiar type, but it is not his fundamentalism, much less his eccentricities, but his intense dramatic preaching that packs his tabernacles. On the other hand, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman is a modernist and he is admittedly one of the great preachers of the world whose voice goes out to the ends of the earth. If we take the outstanding Protestant pulpits in this country and in Europe and in the world the majority of them, we believe, will be found to be occupied by modernists. Several years ago the ministers of this country by a questionnaire selected and named the twenty-five greatest preachers of America and more than two-thirds of them were modernists. It does not appear that modernism has weakened the pulpit.

The same result will be obtained, we believe, if we take the temperature and pulse of the evangelical orthodoxy and spiritual life of the churches. The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., taken as an example, has been pervaded in no small degree by the spirit of modernism, "deeply tainted" the fundamentalists say, and yet Dr. Mark A. Matthews, himself an eminent fundamentalist, declares that "it is sound to the core" and "is ninety-eight per cent orthodox."[13]

More serious is the charge sometimes made that modernism has turned our colleges and universities into anti-Christian institutions where Christian faith is undermined and derided and determinism and agnosticism are taught. We believe this charge is greatly exaggerated. The way to test it is to compare the religious condition in our educational institutions to-day with their condition a century ago. Some astounding statistics have been gathered on this point. They have recently been summarized in the following statement published in *The United Presbyterian* of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

> Statistics from 80 State institutions in 1921 show that out of a total enrolment of 152,461 students, 130,486 had religious affiliations, while 21,975 made no statement regarding their religious life. This is very encouraging when compared with our early history, when even though the colleges were church institutions, practically all the students were outside the church. In Princeton from 1778 to 1782 there was but one professor of religion. At

[13] In a communication in *The Baptist Fundamentalist*, July, 1927.

Bowdoin College in 1807 there was only one Christian. At Yale for four years there was but one, and but four or five in other years about the beginning of the century. Many of the students assumed the names of leading infidels and atheists. Often every student was a professed infidel, or at least outside of the church. Bishop Meade, of Virginia, said in 1811 that William and Mary College was a hotbed of French infidelity, and that for many years in every educated young man whom he met he expected to find an infidel.

These "atheist clubs" in our colleges to-day appear to be a mild recrudescence and breaking out of the rash that was so virulent in the colleges of a hundred years ago. Such waves of youthful infidelity are to be deplored and their causes sought out and, if possible, removed. But there is a much larger body of healthy faith in our young people in these institutions. And while there are some professors in them that indulge in insinuations and attacks against religion, yet they are comparatively few and probably a majority of them are men of reverence and Christian faith. Even our State universities are in the hands of Christian men who invite eminent ministers to speak in their chapels and welcome resident student pastors.

(3) *When Shall We Teach Modernism?* At this point arises a difficult question: When and how shall we teach our young people modern views of the Bible so as to tell the truth about it and yet safeguard its essential spiritual values? The problem, however, is more difficult in theory than it ordinarily is in practice, for we are doing it all the time, even in the Sunday school. We are teaching the Bible in an English translation and this is a tremendous piece of modernism in itself. We are also explaining and applying it so as to make it fit into our circumstances and needs and adjusting it to all our modern knowledge. We need to proceed with prudence and not perplex children with critical questions or crowd them too fast upon older people that are unprepared for them. But much preliminary instruction can from time to time be given. Young people can be introduced to some of the simpler modern views of the Bible so that they will be prepared for further instruction when they go to school and on to college. We know of pastors who are able to do this in such a way that their young people go through college and come back with their faith unshaken but enlightened and enlarged by modern knowledge. Part of the responsibility for the trouble some young people experience with their faith in college may go back to the home and Sunday school and church where they have been taught views that must be modified or the Bible will be

abandoned. Tell young people that they must give up evolution or the Bible and they may take you at your word and surprise you by giving up the Bible. This ill-advised advice may result in a shipwreck of faith and a tragedy in some lives, and it is a terrible mistake that never should be made. "I have come to believe," says the Rev. Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, "that the silence of some pulpits on the demonstrated facts of scientific discovery has alienated large numbers of youths from a religious program which tries to hold the mind back in places from which the mind has long departed. In any case, the truly educated person will insist on a right to make investigation, and he will act regardless of results when once the truth is made clear." The passage from the older to the newer views may be so negotiated that faith will not be lost but will be kept and strengthened.

The author once had an experience on this point that he may be permitted to relate in this connection. After lecturing at a summer school on modern views of the Bible a mother came up and said with some snap of temper, "You don't believe the Bible. I wouldn't let my little daughter hear you for anything." We replied with equal spirit, "My good woman, you are the real menace to your daughter. You are bringing her up in views that will give her trouble when she gets away from you and goes to school." And we parted without further parley. The next day she hunted me up and wanted to talk the matter over in a different state of mind and after a long conversation she said, as she was leaving, "I wish my daughter could hear you." Her conscience made her a bit uneasy about what she might be doing to her daughter, and a clearer understanding of the subject had changed her view. Such instruction can be given in a way that will not undermine the Bible but will get closer to its reality, tell the truth about it and make it appear more reasonable and useful.

We believe that scholarly and reverent modernism, instead of emasculating the gospel and weakening the pulpit and lowering the life of the churches and devitalizing religion in our educational institutions, is helping to save the day in the conflict of Christianity with the peculiar perils of our time. On the other hand, fundamentalism, while doing great good as it stands for fundamental truth and is an anchor to the traditional faith of multitudes

of people, yet has a heavy account of its own to answer for. Its unfriendly attitude towards modern knowledge and its worn out and indefensible methods of contending for the faith, and often its dense and obdurate obscurantism, are positive hindrances to Christianity, especially offending people of learning and culture and causing many of our young people to doubt whether their inherited Christian faith can be defended and maintained in the light of our present knowledge. Even sincere Christian men, while thinking to defend Christian faith, may yet unwittingly wound it in its own house.

Anyway, modernism inevitably has its way in the long run and yet Christianity survives and grows more vigorous and fruitful, and this general fact answers this charge against it and justifies it.

Let it be said again, in closing this chapter, as it has been said or implied all the way through this discussion, that modernism, along with fundamentalism, has its own dangers and has made innumerable mistakes. Infallibility is the last thing it would ever claim for itself or think possible. Yet it may start with or develop a partisan temper of mind and use methods and manifest a spirit that are the bane of religious controversy. Dogmatism is as unscientific and a supercilious air as reprehensible in modernism as in any other quarter. Ill manners are vulgar and offensive anywhere. As modernism is working on the intellectual side of religion it has a tendency to be logical at the expense of life and rational rather than religious. As between an "arid modernism" and an "acrid fundamentalism" there is little to choose: both are sadly missing the main point. However important it is that we unify our total experience, yet when the new knowledge strangles the old faith, or the old faith smothers the new knowledge, an executioner has ruthlessly done its work and left us bereft of one or the other or both. Many an intellectually narrow but religiously earnest and fervent fundamentalist, who is preaching and living the gospel of the spirit of Christ, puts to shame a modernist who may be a master of learning and logic and yet has not learned Christ. On the other hand, a broad-minded, truth-seeking and truth-telling modernist is a shining light and a mainstay of Christian truth and life in comparison with a fanatical fundamentalist who is a ranting obscurantist. Modernism is only a means to the

end of Christian life and love, and when it loses sight of this goal and aims at mere intellectual victory it reverses right relations and its light becomes darkness. Fundamentalism does the same thing when it is more intent on the verbal orthodoxy of a creed than on the living orthodoxy of character, of the mind than of the heart.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that every one should "be fully assured in his own mind," and then all should "follow things that make for peace" and abound in the charity that "never faileth."

CHAPTER XII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We may now summarize our discussions, condensing its chapters into paragraphs, and then draw some general conclusions.

1. Summary

(1) *Introduction.* We live in a world of changes in which knowledge is widening its borders in every direction, and different fields of study are thus coming into common relations with incidental misfits and collisions. Truth is our apprehension of reality and its tests are coherency and workability. It is a necessary principle and belief of our minds that there can be no real disharmony in the totality of truth and that it must cohere in unity and harmony. One of the boundaries delimiting fields of knowledge and life that have the most difficulty in adjusting their relations runs between old faith and new knowledge. Yet in so far as these fields reach truth they must meet in harmony. Modernism is the principle and progressive process of continually unifying our total experience in knowledge and life, bringing the old faith up to date and enlarging and illuminating it with new truth. Its object and results are not destructive but constructive of truth and good.

(2) *Religion.* Religion has its fundamental root in faith which is trust, a root that underlies all our science and life. Religion is our conscious relation to God and is rooted in our entire personality, constitution, intellect, feelings and will. It derives its authority primarily from truth and right as these are established and illuminated by reason, feeling, value judgments and the Christian consciousness. Theology, which is the science of religion, is progressive and shares in the progress of all knowledge and experience.

(3) *Science.* Science is a systematized body of knowledge on any

subject. It aims to gather all the facts in its field, arrange and classify them into order, deduce their causal connections and laws, trace them back to their origin and forecast their future. Observation, experimentation, induction and deduction are its general methods. There are in general two kinds of science, descriptive and normative. Descriptive science, such as physics and chemistry, deals with things as they are, and normative science, such as ethics and esthetics, deals with things as they ought to be, setting up standards and ideals and duties which it imposes as obligations. Descriptive science also deals with measurements, and normative science with values—the one with quantities, and the other with qualities. Each science has expert authority in its own field, but it has no secret or arbitrary authority and must hold its methods and results open to investigation from any quarter. The chief characteristic of science is the scientific spirit, the pure love of truth guided by affinity and sympathy with the subject under investigation and by the spirit of humility. This spirit has been a slow growth but has now pervaded all fields, and theology is subject to it equally with other sciences.

(4) *General Relations of Religion and Science.* Religion and science, originating in and issuing from the same primitive home and going out to study different fields of life, have at points arrived at diverse conclusions, and when they come into comparison often find themselves in disagreement and conflict. Our problem is to find their ground of unity and harmony. There are inadequate solutions of the problem, such as that religion and science move at different levels and need never meet, or that we can let science have its way and yet keep our religious values secure. There is a degree of truth in these superficial views, but they do not go to the root of the matter. This root is the unity of the world from which all lines of thought and life issue and in which they find their ultimate harmony. Religion and science mutually need each other. Religion needs science that it may be imbued with its scientific spirit and derive from it constructive materials for its theology and for its practical help in carrying on its work in the world; science needs religion that it may acquire its reverence for spiritual realities and gain deeper insight into the world and to give our human world essential worth and eternal hope.

(5) *Modern Views of the Bible.* The Bible has necessarily been subjected to the principles and processes of higher criticism with resulting modification of traditional views of its origin and authorship. The Old Testament has undergone a general reconstruction as many of its books have been found to be of composite authorship and have been assigned to later dates than had been ascribed to them. The New Testament has come out with fewer changes and stands on very much the same foundations. The general effect of this reconstruction has been to bring our views of the Bible closer to historical fact and thereby make it for us a truer and more useful book. A process of development has been traced through the Bible by which it advanced from lower to higher stages in accordance with the principle of modernism. The theory of its inerrancy has been rendered untenable, eminent fundamentalists themselves admitting this. These modern views of the Bible do not impair any reasonable theory of its inspiration.

(6) *The Principle of Modernism in the Old Testament.* The principle of modernism, being the progressive unification of our total knowledge and experience, runs through the Bible and at each stage of its development brings it up to date. This process begins on the first page of the Old Testament. The Hebrew story of creation is old Semitic mythology which the writer of Genesis cleared of its polytheism and other outworn religious elements and recast it in the terms of the theism of his day. The same process applies to the story of the Flood. Abraham was a pioneer of new faith, and Moses was a modernist in bringing the Ten Commandments up to date and in his legislation. Modernism continually reshaped the Hebrew idea of God by purifying it of old pagan elements and enlarging and illuminating it with new light, and a progressive scale of moral and religious values runs through the whole book, culminating in the glorious spiritual visions of the prophets. The Old Testament in its day was a tremendous and splendid piece of modernism.

(7) *The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament*: I. *In the Teaching of Jesus.* The distinctive character of the Old Testament is that it is old, and of the New Testament is that it is new, this fact marking a forward movement away from the Old and bringing the New up to date. The New is related to the Old as fruit

to root. In his teaching Jesus applied the principle of modernism in his criticism and correction of the Old Testament, in his conflict with the Pharisees in which he repudiated their outworn creeds and conduct, and in his expressly teaching the principles and applying the methods of modernism in his preaching and parables and more explicitly still in his promise of larger truth to come under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Thus while he was a conservative and fundamentalist in that he held fast to the truth and good in the old revelations, yet he was also a liberal and modernist in that he gave new revelations of his own and provided for their future enlargement and enrichment. And he still ever has for us "a new teaching!"

(8) *The Principle of Modernism in the New Testament*: II. *In the Apostolic Church.* No sooner had Christ gone and Christianity had set out on its own feet on its world-wide march than it encountered the most momentous and epochal conflict of its history, the struggle of the old faith to constrict and strangle the new. The issue was whether Christianity was to be restricted to the Jews as a form of Judaism, or whether it was to be open to the Gentiles as a universal religion. Stephen precipitated the conflict and was the first martyr in this battle for Christian modernism. Peter took the next step in receiving Gentiles, and this led to the first council at Jerusalem that admitted Gentiles to the Christian church. The spirit of catholicity and liberty then broke out in Antioch, and Paul appeared as the master emancipator of the new faith from the bondage of the old. A second council at Jerusalem freed the church from the swaddling clothes of Mosaic ceremonies, especially of circumcision. The battle was thus fought by which the new faith won its freedom from the old and Christianity was released from the narrowness of a Jewish sect into a universal religion. There are distinctly modernistic books in the New Testament—Matthew, Hebrews and Galatians—and also some general modernistic elements such as the Greek language and Greek religion and philosophy. The current of modernism that flows through the Old Testament thus flows in a broadening stream into the New, and the whole Bible in principle and method and spirit is a modernistic book.

(9) *Modernism in the History of the Christian Church.* After

Christianity was expelled from its native land by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., it found itself in a hostile pagan world and came into contact and conflict with pagan religions and philosophies. Its first contact was with Gnosticism, an Oriental philosophical system of religion, and then with Greek thought. In both cases it adjusted itself to the new conditions by a process of give-and-take, absorbing and assimilating some elements from its rivals and new environment, and thus saved and enlarged and enriched its life. The Church Fathers were leaders in this work and sometimes went too far in incorporating Greek ideas and Roman political principles in their Christian system. The councils and creeds of the early Christian centuries marked the points where accumulated theological and ecclesiastical strain threatened disruption, and relief was found in a new expression of faith in accordance with the principle of modernism. In the Middle Ages the church had moved into a new atmosphere of scholasticism, and the great scholastics were also working at the problem of modernizing their faith. The Renaissance was the springtime of our modern world, and Christianity could not escape the change of climate and had to adjust itself to the budding life of the new time. The Reformation was the storm which the spring precipitated, and was a great outburst of modernism. The root of the Reformation, the right of private judgment, is also a root of modernism. The Protestant churches that resulted from the Reformation embodied, each in its own way, their view of Christian doctrine and life and were thus shaped by the spirit of modernism. The modern councils and creeds, Roman Catholic and Protestant, are further endeavors to modernize faith. Thus the process of bringing old faith up to date, which started in Babylon and Egypt and in Genesis and ran on through the Old and then through the New Testament, has come down through the Christian centuries, everywhere gently or forcibly working its will and keeping old faith abreast of new knowledge, and this is modernism.

(10) *Historic Conflicts Between Theology and Science.* Conflicts along the boundary lines of old faith and new knowledge have most frequently and violently happened in the relations between theology and science. These have especially occurred in connection with scientific discoveries as to the flat earth, the moving sun, the

six days of creation, and evolution. In all these conflicts theology in time turned out to be wrong and it has abandoned all of its traditional positions on these points. Yet the conflict is not peculiar to science and religion, there has never been a sharp division between scientists and theologians on these matters, the faults have not been all on one side, and all of these historic conflicts have been adjusted into deeper truth and wider harmony in accordance with the aim of modernism.

(11) *Modernism To-day.* The spirit of modernism is working in all fields to-day more widely and keenly than ever. It has pervaded all Christian churches and none is wholly immune from its silent presence and power. It works a change in climate that cannot be escaped or resisted. It has achieved general results that are commonly accepted, even by conservatives, in Biblical criticism, theories of inspiration, systematic theology, credal revision, and the preaching of the social gospel and of the Kingdom of God. Its practical results are good, however at times it may cause temporary distress. The question of when and how we should teach modernism to our young people is a difficult one, but we should study to do it so as to prepare them for views they will later inevitably encounter.

(12) The summary of the achievements of modernism through the ages is impressive and conclusive as to the necessity and right and beneficent results of this principle and process, and the present condition of Christianity and its outlook for the future in its relation to our ever-growing knowledge puts upon us a heavy weight of solemn responsibility that we do not make the tragic mistake of resisting new truth but that we welcome and make room for it in our system of Christian faith and life.

2. Conclusion

Christianity has a far-flung battle line along which it encounters opposition and attack at many points. Some of these points are more fundamental and strategic than others and from time to time the special pressure of attack shifts from one place to another. Perhaps few would agree as to the order of importance of our fundamentals. Would not the deepest question of all our world be: Is the Power in the universe a Personal Spirit sustaining to us

a Fatherly relation? If this central fortress be not established and held, all is lost. Next in order would come our Christian fundamentals of the Bible as a divine revelation and of Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world.

We have been defending Christianity at a different point of danger which, if not fundamental, lies close at the root of Christian faith, a problem which must be solved or our faith will wither into obscurantism and in time will pass from the world of human intelligence. This is the question of the relation of old faith and new knowledge, of religion to science and culture. This is a crucial point which does not appear important to some minds, and, of course, there are multitudes of good Christian people who have not so much as heard of it. Nevertheless, there are many other things of which they have not heard that are yet of vital importance, even such things as the proper conditions and laws of health. Science and religion, brain and heart, may at first disagree, but they cannot remain in permanent discord and they must get together in harmony or one or both will perish.

We are now in the midst of this conflict, as all the ages have been, and a very great and solemn responsibility rests upon us that we solve and save the situation of our time and hour. Fundamentalists and modernists are alike involved in this responsibility. The fact that fundamentalists are generally sincere and think they are doing God service in their attitude towards our growing knowledge will not excuse them if it turns out that they are opposing the progress of truth and the very promise of Christ that he has yet many things to say unto us and that his Spirit will guide us into all truth. The obscurantism that limits the knowledge and marks the spirit of some of them puts a serious hindrance in the way of people of learning and culture and brings odium on the church and cause of Him who proclaims Himself the truth. The author will never forget the shock he received from a young college woman who said to him, "I will not go any more to a church where I can look up at the pulpit and say, 'Mr. Preacher, I know more than you.'" That remark gave him pause and it may well make all preachers pause and consider.

However, let not modernists think that all the blame at this point rests upon fundamentalists, for they also may show a spirit of rash-

ness and recklessness, conceit and superciliousness that is even more blameworthy and injurious to the cause of truth and religion than deep but sincere obscurantism. Let not the fundamentalist say to the modernist, "I have no need of thee," or the modernist say to the fundamentalist, "I have no need of thee," for these two may work together, if they have the Christian spirit, and each contribute some check or spur to the progress of truth the other needs. Fundamentalist and modernist may be moving at different speeds and, therefore, should stay together. If the fundamentalist walks alone he may go too slow and stop, and if the modernist walks alone he may go too fast and fall; let them walk together and they may move at about the right pace. They need not part company, but can stay together in the broad road on which they are both traveling.

These two types may be complementary. The fundamentalist may be temperamentally more fervent and fiery and the modernist more learned and logical, but either of these gifts without the other is ill-balanced and lacks full-orbed efficiency. Neither a roaring fire nor an electric lamp in the pulpit can shed both heat and light down into the pew. Let fervency and logic, fire and light, be fused in one glowing and luminous personality, set on fire of God Who is both love and light, and the pulpit will warm and enlighten and move the pew. It seems fearfully unseemly, and tragically so, when in the presence of a perishing world these two classes of ministers of the gospel of reconciliation should themselves be unreconciled and engaged in strife. The expulsive power of the grand vision of the Kingdom of God should cure both fundamentalist and modernist of such madness, and both classes should meet in one common faith and fellowship and passionate devotion and service around the cross of their crucified Lord.

When eminent, expert truth-seekers and large portions of the educated Christian world, especially those in our colleges and universities, are opening lines of exploration and discovery in the field of science, it would seem that it would be well and wise for those who are not experts in this field but may be doubtful and alarmed about the reported results of such investigation to follow the advice of Gamaliel who, even though a Pharisee and a member of the Jewish council sitting in judgment on the arrested apostles, had

the wisdom and foresight to say: "And now I say unto you, refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown: but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God."

Let us hear a voice from across the sea and from one of the most conservative communions, the Irish Presbyterian Church. Professor J. Ernest Davey, of the Presbyterian theological college of Belfast, was tried on the general charge of modernism by the Presbytery of Belfast and was acquitted by a large majority. The case was taken up to the General Assembly in June, 1927, where he was again acquitted by a vote of 707 to 82. In defending his presbytery and the professor before the Assembly the Rev. Dr. George Thompson spoke as follows:

> The issue, broadly put, we had to decide, seemed to be this: Is there to be room for scholarship in the church, is our church to be one of sound learning, has the new knowledge as well as the old any rights? Definite as are the main lines of our evangelical belief, are we bound to use exactly and always the same worn phrases, or guided by the Holy Spirit into a fuller understanding, are we not to apply these words in terms suitable to the needs of our own generation? May we not give so much attention to what has been said by them of old time as to have no ear to hear what the Spirit is saying to the churches now? If this is not so, it is hard to see for what purposes theological colleges exist; indeed, they may be closed if professors are merely to rehearse a stereotyped tradition and not to unfold the growing meaning of the gospel; if we are just to repeat parrotwise the theological terms we are ordered to say by some walking embodiments of infallibility. One infallible by the Tiber is one too many for Protestantism, certainly too many for Presbyterianism. Controversy may do some good, but only when controversialists are fair and chivalrous, when they fight the battles of truth with the weapons of truth. Not for the first time have men been so keenly alive to theological subtleties as to be dull to moral values. Vaunted orthodoxy of belief may take up house in the same personality with heterodoxy of temper.

We are drawing our discussion to an end and wish to close on a note of concord on which all can join. The human mind has a profound instinct and thirst for knowledge, which is the light of the soul, and nothing can quench this pervasive and powerful spirit. Equally profound and constitutional is the yearning of the human spirit for God and nothing can uproot this faith or tear eternity

out of the human heart. The God of things as they are is on the side of both truth and faith and the stars are marching with them. We cannot resist either without resisting God. The primitive home of human needs from which both religion and science set out is still large enough to welcome them both as they come back from their quest. True knowledge of all kinds is friendly to faith. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Knowledge is a great builder. It has built our homes and houses of worship, our schools and libraries, and our whole vast, splendid civilization. Its work has just begun and greater and more glorious works will it yet do. It gives us a world in which the human spirit is free to exercise its profoundest yearnings and loftiest aspirations and attain its most splendid achievements; and in which God also is free to satisfy these deepest human needs. It reveals a universe that is transfigured into a vast altar of worship, and it builds a house that is our Father's home.

But faith is also a builder and equally so with knowledge. Was ever a hut or a house built, or a temple dreamed or picture painted or vision turned into a victory that faith did not inspire the mind that conceived it and energize the hand that executed it? Professor Alfred Marshall opens his great work on *Economics* with the statement that "the two great formative agencies of the world's history have been the religious and the economic. Here and there the ardor of the military or the artistic spirit has been for a while predominant: but religious and economic influences have nowhere been displaced from the front rank even for a time; and they have nearly always been more important than all others put together." Religious faith has thus been one of the fundamental builders of the world and no worthy achievement of man's mind and hand has ever been attained without its impulse and power. Faith and knowledge must work together as builders, for faith without knowledge is blind, and knowledge without faith has no worthy objective and motive.

Both faith and knowledge will have discoveries to make and work to do and problems to solve in the future more revolutionary and startling than anything we have ever dreamed. The world to-day needs some new baptism of spiritual truth and power. The Great War has shattered its traditional crusts and set all things

afloat. The world is still an armed camp and welter of wickedness. Russia is an enormous seething volcano in which the marriage tie has been burned away and the family is disappearing, in which irreligion has become the religion, and which is breathing defiance and poisonous gases out upon the world. The Orient has caught the unrest and revolutionary spirit of the Occident and has launched out upon deeps, it knows not whither. Science is morally bankrupt and all our social philosophies and programs are breaking down. Our magic machines are equally potent for evil as for good. Flying through the heavens is not flying nearer to heaven or even towards it. Capturing the sky for America is not conquering the earth for the Kingdom of God. If the light that is in us be darkness, how great is that darkness?

Where stands Christianity in this day of crisis? It stands at the crossroads, itself on trial. Its enemies say that it is dying and that its corpse will soon no longer cumber the earth. And it does show symptoms and conditions that may well give us anxiety. The Eastern Orthodox Church with its one hundred and twenty-two millions of adherents is dreaming in Oriental stagnation and sleep. The Roman Catholic Church with its two hundred and seventy-two millions has crystallized into an autocratic and unspiritual system. And Protestantism with its one hundred and seventy-one millions has tragically divided and dissipated its strength and efficiency in its hundred discordant creeds and churches. Watchman, what of the night? And are there signs of the morning?

The world needs a new upheaval in the twentieth century such as turned it upside down in the first century. No patching up of credal disagreements and joining of denominational divisions can do such work unless there is let loose a flood of spiritual power that will saturate and submerge all these superficial differences and fill men with the mind of Christ. Is there any promise of this? Jesus himself left with his disciples a promise that contains divine dynamic to do this work: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." These broader truths are coming in upon us and are yet to come. All our growing knowledge is the progressive ful-

filment of this promise and is yet only as morning twilight compared with noonday splendor.

Can we bear this promised truth? It will surely sweep away many things we think vital and work changes that will startle and alarm us or our children. Present denominational forms of Christianity may pass away and new forms may come. Can we bear this? Present creeds and churches have been good as necessary means and stages in the development of Christianity, but we are not to cling to them as finalities and build them as barriers across the path of the Kingdom of God. We have a longer scale of time than our fathers, and humanity may endure on the planet for hundreds of thousands of years. Much may pass that has had its day. We may grow timid as we go forward into these unknown changes and fear that our Christian faith may be swept away in the flood of the centuries. The disciples of Jesus had this very experience: "Jesus was going before them: and as they followed, they were afraid." So we may have fears as to whither Christ is going and may tremblingly ask, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Yet Jesus led these fearing disciples through dreadful scenes and sufferings into the glory of the resurrection, and we may trust him that the things that are yet to come will not be less but more glorious than what we now believe and see and that though heaven and earth shall pass, yet not one jot or tittle of his words shall fail.

The principle and process of modernism will have to negotiate and adjust these changes. All it has done is only a beginning of what it must yet do. We must let it work but try to keep it under the guidance of the Spirit of all truth. We must trust Christ as he fulfills his tremendous promise of such guidance to-day and through the coming ages. Wisdom was not born with us, neither will it die when we pass away. We may help or we may hinder the fulfilment of this promise, and it is the only promise of light and life for our world.

In conclusion, old faith and new knowledge when worked out in their logical relations are not mutually exclusive and antagonistic but are complementary and harmonious. They join in reaching wider truth and better faith. They are equally included in the one comprehensive and unbroken circle of total truth and stream out

as radiating rays from the same central splendor of God. They are the two main architects and builders of our world and they look out upon a vast and inviting future in which God will pour His Spirit upon all flesh and the sons and daughters of that day shall prophesy and its old men shall dream dreams and its young men shall see visions. Faith and knowledge are consistent materials and constructive builders of one grand temple of worship, concordant strains of one vast cosmic symphony and song. By their origin and nature they are wedded into union, however at times they have been temporarily estranged, and what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell,
That mind and soul according well,
May make one music as before,

But vaster.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven; and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of saints, the Forgiveness of sins; the Resurrection of the body; and the Life everlasting. Amen.

INDEX

Abelard, 183-185
Abraham, pioneer of modernism, 116-119
Agnosticism, 236-238
Angus, S., 168
Anselm, 183-185
Antioch, church at, 154-156
Apollinaris, 181
Aquinas, 183-185
Aristotle, 56, 176, 187
Arius, 177, 180
Arnold, Matthew, quoted, 33
Assembly, Presbyterian General, on inerrancy of the Bible, 102, 103
Athanasius, 176, 177, 180
Atonement, theories of, 184-185
Augustine, 141, 176
Authority, in religion, 39-51
Aytoun, Robert A., 125

Bacon, Francis, 57
Badé, Professor, quoted, 12
Balfour, A. J., quoted, 229, 234
Baptist, church, 193
Barton, Professor, quoted, 122-123
Bateson, William, his theory of evolution, 215
Beauty, as root of religion, 36; a way of knowing the world, 82-84
Beckwith, Charles A., 123
Behaviourism, 230, 232
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 203
Bennett, W. H., quoted, 119
Bergson, 230, 241
Berkeley, 241
Bible, modern theories of, 91-108; general aspects of, 97-99; inspiration and inerrancy of, 99-106; 247-248
Birkhoff, George D., quoted, 72
Birth, The Virgin, 22, 273
Bradley, F. H., 236
Brahe, Tycho, 220
Briggs, Charles A., 246-247
Browning, quoted, 7, 83
Bosanquet, Bernard, quoted, 241-242
Bowne, Borden P., 241
Buckland, 206
Budge, E. Wallis, his work on *Assyriology*, 109

Cadman, S. Parkes, 256
Caird, Edward, quoted, 33
Calkins, Raymond, quoted, 82
Calvin, 100, 141, 191, 204
Change, part it plays in the world, 3-4
Chown, S. D., quoted, 247-248
Christ, person of, 184
Chrysostom, 176
Church, The Apostolic, modernism in, 146-170; modern, 193-196; Roman Catholic, 193-195, 271; Protestant, 193-196, 271; Eastern Orthodox, 271
Church, Presbyterian in the U. S. A., 256
Clemens, Carl, 168
Clement, of Rome, 176
Conference, World, Stockholm, 254; Lausanne, VI, 254
Confessions, of Faith, Westminster, on the Scriptures, 103, 106, 194; revision of, 251; Augsburg, 197; Reformed, 197; Anglican, 197; Baptist, 197; Methodist, 197; Congregational, 197; United Presbyterian, 251
Congregational, church, 193
Conscience, 84
Consciousness, The Christian, as authority in religion, 46-49
Controversy, part it plays in growth of truth, 4-5
Copernicus, 65, 141, 203, 204, 220
Cosmas, Egyptian monk, 201
Coulter, John M., 218
Councils, church, First at Jerusalem,

151-154; Second at Jerusalem, 159-162; Nicæa, 177, 181; ancient, 179-182; Constantinople, 181; Ephesus, 181; Chalcedon, 181
Counter-Reformation, 194
Creation, Hebrew story of, 109-114; six days of, 206-207
Creeds, ancient, 179-182; modern, 196-198; revision of, 250-252; Apollinarian, 181. See Confessions
Criticism, Biblical, 246

Darwin, 64, 141, his *Origin of Species*, 208; his theory of natural selection, 213
Davey, Professor J. Ernest, 269
Davis, John D., his work on *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*, 110; quoted, 111
Dayton, Tenn., 210, 245
Dead, Egyptian Book of, 120-121
De Burgh, W. G., quoted, 7
Decalogue, an instance of modernism, 119-122
Deduction, as scientific method, 57-58
Deissmann, Professor, 167
Dependence, as root of religion, 36
De Vries, his theory of evolution, 213
Dewey, John, quoted, 18
Driver, Professor R. S., quoted, 121

Earth, the flat, 200-202
Edison, Thomas, 77
Einstein, his relativity, 22, 215
Emerson, quoted, 249
Erasmus, quoted, VI, 188
Eutyches, 181
Evolution, 64, 207-219; defined, 207; evidences for, 211-212; theories of, 213-214; and the American Association for the Advancement of science, 214; in Princeton Theological Seminary, 215.
Experience, nature of, 8-9

Fairbairn, A. M., quoted, 178-179, 184
Fairweather, William, quoted, 168-169, 170
Faith, defined, 28-32; a builder, 271
Faraday, 77
Fatalism, 232
Fathers, The Church, 176-179
Feeling, as authority, 42-43
Flood, the Hebrew story of, 114-115
Forest, William M., 202
Franklin, Benjamin, quoted, 29; referred to, 77
Frazer, J. G., quoted, 33
Fundamentalism, explained, 17-18; compared with modernism, 23-27

Galatians, Epistle to, a modernistic book, 164-165
Galileo, 57, 203
Garvie, A. E., quoted, 179
Genesis, First Chapter of, 113-114
Gladstone, William E., 206
Gnosticism, 172-176
God, grounds of belief in, 34-39; Hebrew conception of, 123-125; sovereignty of, 124-125; character of, 125; agnostic and pantheistic theories of, 235-239; immanence of, 240, 249
Goethe, quoted, VIII
Goodness, 84
Gore, Bishop Charles, on inerrancy of the Bible, 105-106
Gospel, the social, 252-253
Greene, William Brenton, on evolution, 215

Haldane, J. S., 234
Hall, G. Stanley, quoted, 66
Halliday, W. R., 168
Hamilton, Sir William, 236
Hammurabi, laws of, 122-123
Harnack, 171, quoted, 173
Hastings, *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, quoted, 19, 173
Hebrews, Epistle to, a modernistic book, 163-164
Hegel, 241
Herrick, C. Judson, 232
Herschel, John, quoted, 224
Hobbes, 182
Hodge, Charles, on inerrancy of the Bible, 103-104; on Darwinism, 209

Hoernle, Professor R. F., quoted, 74-75, 241
Höffding, Professor, quoted, 118
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, quoted, VI
Horne, Herman H., quoted, 144
Horton, Robert F., 235, 243
Houdin, Albert, quoted, 19
Humanism, 187-188
Hume, David, 236
Humility, as condition of truth, 63
Huxley, Thomas, quoted, 31, 63, 241

Idealism, philosophical, 231, 237, 241, 249
Induction, as scientific method, 57-58
Inerrancy, of the Bible, *see* Bible
Inge, Dean, quoted, 16-17
Inspiration, of the Bible, *see* Bible
Intellect, as root of religion, 37

James, William, quoted, 33, 79, 241
Jastrow, Professor, his work on *Babylonia and Assyria*, 111, 115, 122
Jeans, J. H., 233
Jenner, 64
Jennings, H. S., quoted, 55-56
Jerome, 176
Jesus, quoted, VI, 63, his modernism, 134-145
Jevons, Professor, quoted, 64
Joad, C. E. M., 233
Jordan, W. G., quoted, 107
Judaizers, The, 153

Kant, Immanuel, quoted, 44, 236, 241
Keller, Adolf, quoted, 244
Kelvin, Lord, 141, quoted, 244
Kingdom of God, 253-254
Knudson, Albert C., 241

Labels, use and abuse of, 16, 26
Lamarck, his theory of evolution, 214
Language, its nature, 14-17
Lankester, Ray, quoted, 81-82
Laplace, 57
Law, universality of and religious faith, 228-230
Learning, Revival of, 187
Legislation, Mosaic, 122-123
Leibnitz, 57
Lenormant, François, 110, quoted, 112
Lilley, A. L., quoted, 19
Lister, 64
Locke, John, quoted, 13
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 64, 65, 218, 235
Loisy, Alfred, and modernism, 19
Lotze, Hermann, quoted, 44, 229, 238
Lowell, quoted, VI
Lull, Professor R. S., 212
Luther, 100, 190-191, 204
Lutheran, church, 193
Lyell, Sir Charles, 64, 200, 206

Macartney, Clarence E., on inerrancy of the Bible, 104-105
Mackintosh, H. R., quoted, 101
Macpherson, Hector, 217
Malthus, 65
Marshall, Professor Alfred, quoted, 270
Materialism, 230-235
Mathews, Shailer, quoted, 164-165
Matthew, Gospel of, a modernistic book, 162-163
Matthews, Mark A., 256
McConnell, Samuel D., quoted, 144
McCosh, James, 208-209, 210, 211, 217
Mendel, 65
Mendeléef, Dmitri, quoted, 12
Michelangelo, 187
Mill, John Stuart, quoted, 72
Millikan, Robert A., quoted, 79, 82, 144, 218, 235
Milton, 141
Minto, Professor, quoted, 56
Modernism, explained, 17-23; defined, 22; compared with fundamentalism, 23-27; principle of in the Bible, 107-108; in the Old Testament, 109-130; in the New Testament, 131-147; in the teaching of Jesus, 134-145; in the Apostolic Church, 146-170; in the history of the Christian Church, 171-198; in conflicts between science and theology, 109-122; today, 223-260; in religion, 242-257; when should we teach? 257-259; summary of, 261-266; conclusion, 266-273
More, L. T., quoted, 64

Morley, John, quoted, 33
Moses, the modernist, 119-123
Müller, Max, quoted, 14
Münsterberg, Hugo, quoted, 6
Murray, Robert H., quoted, 64, 71, 221

Names, their use and abuse, 14-17
Nestorius, 181
Newman, John Henry, quoted, 41-42
Newton, Isaac, 57, 141, 145
Nicholson, B. H., 233
Norris, J. Frank, 204

Obligation, of truth, 11-14; as root of religion, 36
Origin, 176
Osborn, Henry F., 218

Pantheism, 238-239
Pascal, quoted, 42
Pasteur, 64
Patton, Francis L., quoted, 26-27, 42; on inerrancy of the Bible, 104; on evolution, 209; 215, 217, 248
Paul, quoted, VI, 21, 62, 100, 141, 146; the master modernist, 157-159
Paul V, Pope, 203
Personalism, 239-242
Peter, a progressive modernist, 150-151
Peter, the Lombard, 185
Pharisees, the fundamentalists of their day, 135-137
Philosophy, and religious faith, 235-242
Pius X, Pope, his encyclical on Modernism, 19
Plato, his philosophy, 56, 168, 176, 187, 241
Pragmatism, 43-44
Priestly, 65
Price, George McCready, 216
Princeton, Theological Seminary, 215, 216; Theological Review, 216
Prophets, Hebrew, progressive vision of, 128-130
Pryke, W. M., quoted, 20

Raphael, 187
Reason, as authority, 40-42
Reformation, The, 190-192
Religion, defined, 32-34; roots of, 34-39; authority in, 39-50; why conservative, 66; relation to science, 68-89, 218-219; needs science, 75-78; and modernism today, 223-260
Renaissance, The, 186-189
Reuchlin, 188
Revision, credal, 250-252
Ritschl, Albrecht, quoted, 49, 71
Robinson, T. H., quoted, 92-93
Royce, Josiah, 241
Russell, Bertrand, his theory of knowing the world, 85-89

Sanday, William, quoted, 19-20
Schleiermacher, quoted, 33
Scholasticism, 182-186
Science, progressive, 51; definition and method of, 51-58; kinds of, 59-60; relation to religion, 68-89; needs religion, 78-82; conflicts with theology, 109-222; 218-219
Scott, E. F., quoted, 175
Seeley, J. R., quoted, 33
Seymour, Charles A., quoted, 81
Shapley, Harold, quoted, 226
Shakespeare, 141, 227
Sheldon, Charles M., quoted, 258
Sheppard, H. L., 202
Simpson, J. S. Y., 218
Skinner, Professor John, quoted, 115, 119
Smith, Hay Watson, 209
Smyth, Newman, quoted, 20
Sophocles, quoted, 13
Spencer, Herbert, 236-237, 241
Spinka, Matthew, quoted, VI
Spirit, the scientific, 60-67
Stephen, first martyr for modernism, 147-150
Stephen, Leslie, 236
Sterret, J. M., quoted, 20
Stewart, George, quoted, 244
Streeter, B. H., 59
Stuart, Moses, 206
Subscription, to Westminster Confession, 252

Sun, The moving, 202-206
Sunday, Billy, 256
Tennyson, quoted, VI, 4, 8, 42-43, 83, 141, 273
Tertullian, 176
Testament, New, historical criticism of, 93-97; modernism in the Gospels, 109-145; in the Apostolic Church, 146-170; modernistic writings, 162-165; general modernistic elements in, 165-170
Testament, Old, historical criticism of, 91-93; modernism in, 109-130
Theology, a progressive science, 51-54; conflicts with science, 109-222
Theory, nature of, 6-7
Thompson, J. Arthur, quoted, 55, 218
Thompson, George, quoted, 269
Truth, its nature, 5-9; infinitude of, 9-11; obligation of, 11-14; as primary authority, 39; love of, 60-61; sympathy with, 61; humility as condition of, 63; unity of, 73
Tyndall, John, 232
Tyrrell, George, 19

Universe, vastness of and religious faith, 223-228
Urban, Pope, 203
Value, as root of religion, 36; value judgments, 44-46
Vinci, da, 187
Voliva, Wilbur G., 204
Voltaire, quoted, 3

Wallace, Alfred Russel, 200
Ward, James, 8, 241
Wardle, W. Lansdell, his work on *Israel and Babylon*, 108, 110, 115, 121, 122
Wells, H. G., 239, 241
Wesley, John, 141, 204
White, Andrew D., his *Warfare of Science with Theology*, 65, 204-205, 206, 208, 218, 220
Will, as root of religion, 38; as authority, 43-44
Wilson, Woodrow, on evolution, 209
Wonder, as root of religion, 36
Words, their use and abuse, 14-17
Wordsworth, quoted, 83
World, unity of, 71-75; ways of knowing, 82-89

Zoroastrianism, 72
Zwingli, 188

INVENTORY
1941
1954

DATE DUE

970

BL 240 .S67 1968

Snowden, James Henry, 1852-
1936.

Old faith and new knowledge

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BL240.S67 1968
Snowden, Jame Old faith and new knowledg
3 0645 0004 1572 5